DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 854 IR 002 563

AUTHOR	Strother, Jeanne D.
TITLE	An Investigation of the Relationship of Faculty Knowledge and Use of Current Reference and Para-Reference Books Especially Pertinent to Their Fields.
INSTITUTION	Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind. Dept. of Library Science.
PUB DATE	Aug 75
NOTE	144p.; Master's Thesis, Ball State University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Information Needs; Library Research; Library Surveys; Masters Theses; Professors; Questionnaires; *Reference Books; Speech; State Universities; Theater Arts; *University Libraries; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Current Awareness

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire designed to investigate faculty use and awareness of current reference works was administered to the Department of Speech at Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana. The first part was a checklist of older, established, or ongoing reference works in the areas of speech, speech pathology, audiology, and theater. The second part asked the faculty members (1) to indicate their use and knowledge of listed current reference works, and (2) to answer questions about their needs, attitudes, and habits in regard to current reference materials. Results indicated that a considerable portion of reference literature has escaped the attention and use of the faculty members, that the faculty tended to use older, better known materials, and that the reason for low use of recent materials was a lack of knowledge that they existed. The situation could be improved if librarians would make greater efforts to provide faculty with information about new reference books. (LS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112854

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF FACULTY KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF CURRENT REFERENCE AND PARA-REFERENCE BOOKS ESPECIALLY PERTINENT TO THEIR FIELDS

A RESEARCH PAPER

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COUNCIL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

MASTER OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

by
JEANNE D. STROTHER

ADVISERS: MARINA AXEEN AND NEAL COIL

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

AUGUST, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 002563

PREFACE

The idea for this investigation evolved from the many comments regarding the increasing number of reference books which were appearing in the library which the investigator heard during the course of her study in library science and during her period of service as a graduate assistant in the Division of Reference Services in the Ball State University Library. It also took shape from the reading done for the coursework in Library Science 565, Research in Librarianship. It was assisted in its growth by the fact that the investigator had access to a potential sample population. For three years she had served as a temporary teacher of public speaking in the Department of Speech, during which time it was possible to observe some of the reference needs of a portion of that faculty and the structure of the department. Retrospectively, its faculty seemed an ideal group for study. Slowly the idea of their serving as actual subjects for the study and the refinement of the problem regarding faculty use and knowledge of current reference books grew until the two ideas finally grew together.

When the idea was presented to Dr. Alan Huckleberry, Chairman of the Department of Speech, he graciously consented to present the request to his faculty. The members of that group have proved willing, cooperative, and helpful co-workers in a project that would not have existed without them. Their courtesy is all the more appreciated because of the nature of the study, for perhaps only very secure people would hazard participation in such an investigation. That they were secure long before the study has been appreciated for some time by the investigator, and that fact provided the courage to ask for their assistance.

Dr. Ray Suput, Director of the Ball State University Library, was also consulted about the investigation. The Department of Library Science and the Department of Library Services have so much the same sound to the ear that the writer felt that Dr. Suput should be apprised of the project and his approval obtained. Moreover, Library Services provided the collection used in the study. Dr. Suput's approval does not necessarily imply endorsement of subject or method, and any misuse of the library collection is claimed solely by the author of the study.

Advice on the wording of questionnaire forms and definitions was given by Miss Juanita Smith of Reference Service. Her considerable constructive criticism is much appreciated, as are the valuable comments of fellow graduate students to whom questionnaire forms were submitted.

Serving as co-advisors to the project, Dr. Marina Axeen, Chairman of the Department of Library Science, guided the structure of the study, while Mr. Neal Coil gave advice on reference works and reference ambience as well as on the general progress of the paper. Their invaluable assistance, time, and patience are gratefully recognized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM 1

II. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM AND SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE 9

III. THE POPULATION AND THE METHOD 19

IV. FINDINGS 28

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 97

NOTES 114

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 116

APPENDIX 119

6

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Percentage of Titles Used in Each Category of Questionnaire A By Each Group 32

2 Comparison of the Percentage of Use by Each Group and by the Department, Listed by Title Applicability 47

3 Total Instances of Response in the Categories of Reference Sources Listed in Questionnaire A with Total Instances of Volunteered Titles Offered by Groups 52

4 Percentages of Response in Categories of Reply of Questionnaire B, Part I, by Single Respondents of Groups A, B, and C 59

5 Percentage of Knowledge and Use of Separate Reference Books Listed in Questionnaire B by Group A 67

6 Percentage of Knowledge and Use of Separate Reference Books Listed in Questionnaire B by Group B 68

7 Percentage of Knowledge and Use of Separate Reference Books Listed in Questionnaire B by Group C 69

8 Percentage of Knowledge and Use of Current Reference Books by Groups A, B, and C and by the Department Arranged by Chronological Sub-Periods Within the Five-Year Period 75

9 Computation by Group of Additional Books Respondents Would Have Been Likely to Use If They Had Known of Them . . 79

10 Extent of the Differences Between Percentages of Use of the Area Books of Questionnaire A and Those of Questionnaire B by Groups A, B, and C, Separately and Combined 81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

University teaching and research make recourse to reference materials a matter of fact. Undergraduates are directed to them at varying levels, graduates at others, and faculty reference proceeds at still another. Taken together, the total amount of faculty-initiated reference, whether for themselves or their students, is considerable. Furthermore, the need for reference materials is inherent in most, if not all, subject fields. But what are the reference habits of faculty members? How do they use reference materials? Are they cognizant of the new sources of reference within their library? Do they utilize them? Questions of this sort have helped mark the direction of the present inquiry.

The Problem

This exploratory survey investigates the use of current reference works by a selected sample of university faculty in an effort to discover what, if any, relationship exists between faculty awareness of current reference works and their use of them, and what attitudes and opinions are held by faculty members regarding their reference needs, especially those pertaining to current reference materials.

The rationale for such a study rests upon two facts:

(1) the actual proliferation of reference literature to awkward proportions, and (2) the dearth of studies which address themselves to how much of this literature escapes faculty attention. Combined, these facts urge an inquiry.

Logic seems to suggest that given two sources, one older and one newer, and other things being equal, a faculty member by training will select that reference item which gives the fresher look. Yet faculty people are busy people engaged in teaching, researching, publishing, community involvement, and sometimes administrating. For them to seek out by their own devices the newest reference sources as opposed to recent editions of recognized, well-known ones requires additional time, a fuller schedule, and extra effort. Nor can it unquestioningly be supposed that the courtesy extended to many faculties by the personnel of many libraries in sending them lists of new acquisitions helps their dilemma. Such lists are likely to have unannotated entries containing perhaps author, title, imprint, and classification number. While these lists do inform faculty members of the presence of new books in the library, the similarity of the format of the entries, the lack of substantive description, and ambiguous, general, or obscuring titles leave them with a list but with no way of knowing whether any of the items on the list may be useful to them or not. The likely result of this casual contact with only reference titles (and perhaps this is more likely to be true of reference titles than with titles of specialized, in-depth treatises of specific subjects in which faculty members have extraordinarily deep interest) is that they are likely to be forgotten.

Stated in its simplest form, then, the question around which this study is designed may be posed in this way: To what extent does current reference literature pertinent to a given discipline and held by the university library escape the attention and use of faculty members of that discipline?

The Hypothesis

The hypothesis which guides the study is that the faculty members of a university tend not to use the current reference sources pertaining to their subject fields and held by the library as readily as they use older, better-known library reference sources, in part because they are unaware of the existence of the newer reference tools.

The Scope

The study is limited to an investigation of faculty use of reference tools which have special importance in their fields of study. While it is primarily concerned with their use of current reference works, it also inquires into their use of the older, more standard works applying to their field. It does not attempt to measure the frequency of library use, the quality of use, nor the degree to which the faculty utilizes any existing library service other than those reference works pertaining to their special fields of study. Its emphasis is on use as related to awareness, although in that portion of the study which concerns itself with older, more established reference tools, inquiry is limited to use.

The Assumptions

Certain assumptions are made in the prosecution of this study:

(1) It is assumed that faculty are not different from librarians or other people who deal with books and their contents as a profession in their efforts and their good intentions of keeping up with current literature, reference or otherwise.

(2) It is assumed that faculty members have needs for reference materials both for their students and for themselves.

(3) It is assumed that at least a part of their reference needs must be answered within the library among reference sources pertinent to their field.

(4) It is accepted as true that faculty members tend to select the most recent known source of information when that source does not quarrel with authority.

(5) It is also accepted as logical that use, while not a necessary concomitant, is one indication of awareness of publications.

(6) It is assumed that the sample population of faculty used in the study is not significantly different from the total faculty population of the university in terms of

academic or reference habits.

(7) It seems reasonable to assume that within the group under study there will be variations of acquaintanceship with the literature dictated by personal subject specialization.

Definition of Terms

As used in this study, certain terms should be given the following meanings:

The term _faculty_ or _faculty members_ is used to mean the body of classroom teachers employed by the university. It is frequently limited to the sample population.

Pertinent is used to mean relevant, suitable, or answering the need of the faculty-student specialized activities of the subject field from the point of view of that specialty.

The term _reference work_ (_reference source_, _reference book_) is best defined for the purpose of this study as "any book which is used to refer to for specific information."[1] In concentrating upon reference materials for a particular subject field, this study employs the term somewhat more liberally than conservatively, using the criterion of usefulness for reference as a modifying factor on the above definition. To be considered in the concept is that definition afforded by the American Library Association: A reference book is "a book designed by its arrangement and treatment to be consulted for definite items of information rather than to be read consecutively."[2] For this study this definition should also be given a liberal interpretation. In terms of category, reference works may be one of the following kinds of works: abstracts, almanacs, annuals, atlases, bibliographies, calendars, catalogs, checklists, collections, compendiums, concordances, dictionaries, digests, directories, encyclopedias, finding lists, gazetteers, guidebooks, guides to literature, handbooks, indexes, inventories, loose-leaf services, manuals, red books, registers, source books, surveys, tables, union lists, yearbooks, or any reasonable variation of any of these.

A para-reference work in this study refers to those works within a given subject field that contain specialized information in some kind of orderly arrangement which because of its recency or level of specialization is likely to appear in no standard reference book.

A current reference or para-reference book, source, or work is used to mean any reference publication falling within any of the above categories whose shelving date was January 1, 1970, or after. The shelving date is used as a criterion of definition because in the library used for the study it coincides with the issuance of new acquisitions lists to faculty more nearly than the publication date or even the acquisition date, although reference books tend to get high priority in processing and might be expected to arrive on the shelves shortly after being received.

The term current awareness as it is used in this study is a shorthand term used to mean faculty knowledge of the existence of those reference sources mentioned in the previous definition.

The Importance of the Study

The study does not have a grand design nor does it deal in large numbers of either faculty members or reference books. It must be considered as an exploratory probe, a pilot study. It does address itself to a subject that reading and discussion suggest has not been adequately explored. If this is an accurate assessment of the situation, then the study has some merit for three reasons:

(1) It is the investigator's way to study that which has not been explored; the relationship of the faculty member to reference books is there and ripe for inquiry.

(2) It is generally conceded that the central purpose of the academic library is to support the programs of students and faculty and to provide a collection of resources for research. In the search to discover how best both kinds of these faculty-originating programs can be supported, it becomes necessary to discover how many of the resources accessioned into the library the faculty discover for themselves or with the aids which they have at present. It is necessary to know to what degree there is a further need to alert to current reference sources.

(3) From the standpoint of library functioning, it makes for good economy, effective communication, good

intermesh of demand and supply, and sound sense to know exactly what and how much awareness exists. The opportunity at hand provided by a favorable convergence of circumstances makes an exploration possible through this study.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM AND SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the increase in the number of reference works available for consultation presently and discusses the literature bearing upon the present study.

Volume of Reference Materials

The proliferation of reference materials has been occurring for some time. In a symposium as early as 1953, Herman Fussler, then the director of libraries at the University of Chicago, speaking of printed material in general, declared: "The flood of print in all its forms is almost certainly increasing at exponential rates and at rates substantially in excess of the growth of libraries."[3]

Today the experience of the academic reference librarian in any prospering library in the land affirms Fussler's early statement. The academic librarian who works in the area of acquisition or of reference is aware that it is virtually impossible to keep informed of the numerous reference works appearing in the library. Such despair rests partly on the fact that the librarian takes all disciplines for his domain, and in all of them knowledge continues to explode and splinter. The splintering and the exploding produce not only new editions of standard works but also completely new works competitive in their efforts to do a better job of referencing the new and more specialized areas of knowledge.

Statistical evidence for the numerical increase of reference sources is somewhat difficult to abstract from the annual reports of the book publishing industry for two reasons: (1) Subscription reference books are not listed by numbers of titles published but merely by dollars of sales, and (2) there is no separate count for monographic reference sources sold on a non-subscription basis. However, although the books so reported represent only a part of the reference books published in America for the period, a study of the output of general works by American book publishers from 1966 through 1973 shows a significant increase in numbers published during that time. In the eight years from 1966 through 1973, 6,764 books termed general works were published, and of that number 4,783, or 70.7 per cent, were new books. In the years 1971-1973 alone there was a great increase in this category of publishing and many of the titles were new rather than new editions of older works. The 715 titles published in 1971, 802 in 1972, and 833 in 1973 were 72.4 per cent of the total 1,012 titles published in 1971, 1,048 in 1972, and 1,187 in 1973. Although the difference in the percentages of new publishing for the eight-year period and the three-year period is not very impressive, the consistently high percentage of new titles constitutes the problem. The numerical increase in published general works titles within the eight-year period adds to it: In 1966 there were 644 general works titles published: in 1973 there were 1,187 for an 84 percent increase.[4] Those new reference works outside general works cannot be estimated from industry reports.

Further evidence of the increase in current reference works is afforded by the American Reference Books Annual, which provides comparative figures for the number of books its reviewers have reviewed in the years 1970-1973 by year and which purposes to review almost all of the new reference books published. This annual reviewing tool reports having reviewed 1,490 books in 1970 and 1,838 in 1974 for a 22.3 per cent increase in reviewing--and in new reference books.[5]

Such figures produce problems for librarians, but, more importantly to this study, they describe a large body of new reference materials which the faculty must use or ignore. The avalanche of recent reference titles to which faculty members must react is real.

Before describing in detail the nature of this study which attempts to explore that reaction, a review of the literature which suggests a need for such a study follows.

Review of the Literature

Professional literature and published research studies provide a remarkably small amount of research literature which deals with the reference needs of the faculty. In fact, in the booklet compiled by David H. Eyman, Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science: Titles Accepted by

Accredited Library Schools, 1930-1972, only 13 reference-related studies of any kind pertaining to faculty are cited for the entire period of 42 years, and there is no research listed there which studies the problem of reference materials as they relate to faculty.[6]

A search in wider circles during the years 1930-1960, while it most strikingly reveals the theme of alienation between librarians and faculty members, does not reveal concern about faculty use of reference works or other materials. It is possible that inquiry into faculty reference habits may have seemed inappropriate during those years in view of the reported relationship existing between the two groups.

Some studies of faculty attitudes toward, and use of, library services were never published because they were regarded as having only local value. Some were. Among them can be cited the Tauber, Cook, and Logsdon study of the Columbia University Libraries[7] and the one by Tanis of the Kansas State College Library.[8] Whitten in 1959 conducted a study of 72 liberal arts colleges in which he polled librarians, administrators, and faculty regarding the role of the library in the teaching process and its relationship to classroom teaching and teachers.[9] These studies have relation to the present study only insofar as there is some overlap of the information sought by the questionnaires of those studies and a portion of one of the questionnaires of the present one. While the three mentioned studies sought a sweeping response to library practice as it touched the faculty, the present study concentrates on reference needs and habits.

A look at the more recent literature, that of the last 15 years or so, shows a continued attitude of separateness and mistrust on the part of faculty and librarians. Logsdon, writing as late as 1970, spoke of the difference in point of view between the groups by recalling a comment by Austin Evans, Columbian historian: "'The librarian and the scholar,'" he quoted, "'are eternal enemies.'"[10] The studies of this decade indicate that, if they are no longer enemies, they are still less than full colleagues. In a study conducted at Monteith College, Wayne State University, Knapp found that the faculty did not see the librarians as actual co-partners in the task of teaching students to do research. As a matter of fact, some of the faculty were critical of the librarians' approach to research, believing that the scholars' methods are something quite different from that approach.[11] Schumaker's study of the awareness and the use of services by students and faculty of Hamline University Library indicated that neither group had any great awareness of the several services offered by the library despite the fact that a list of such services had been recently distributed. "It is apparent," she wrote, "that if the librarian wants the faculty to make use of the range of available services he and his staff must market them, . . . "[12] In a larger and somewhat similar study, Nelson reported the extent to which six California college libraries had been able to inform the college faculty members of their schools of the services available in their respective libraries. This study selected 1,067 faculty members from the six California colleges as a random sample to whom a questionnaire listing the library services was sent. The respondents were to indicate (a) that the service was available, (b) that the service was not available, or (c) that the status of the service was unknown. Nelson discovered that there was faculty awareness of less than one-half of the library's services. He also discovered that awareness was related to discipline, faculty rank, weekly use of the library, committee service, and length of teaching experience.[13] Perhaps even more remarkable was the outcome of the study of De Hart which tried to measure the effect of the introduction of special library services and techniques on service to the users. Her hypothesis was that service would be greater in quantity and better in quality when special services and techniques were introduced. The hypothesis was denied; but in the progress of the study, the faculty seemed less than adaptive to the new services and did not, with limited exception, avail themselves of special assistance by the library personnel.[14]

There have been, however, reports of optimistic attitudes and action. Lehman, writing in the Southeastern Library of ways in which the library can take the initiative in service to the faculty, suggested a "system of selective dissemination of information," as well as the breaking down of barriers of communication by informal contacts, the inclusion of faculty on library committees, and the willingness of librarians to serve on faculty committees. He suggested that these methods could lead to understanding and mutual appreciation, to close relationships between the faculty and the library.[15] From such relationships, it was implied, comes the necessary dialogue for progress. His is a representative voice in the literature.

Hall, writing of British universities, made the point that information (current awareness) services are needed, and if the library does not take the opportunity to incorporate them into its offerings to patrons, they will be supplied by someone else. He felt that it is important for the library to give this service even in the face of serious problems for those who do--problems like the difficulty of spanning disciplines with the service, being limited by staff scarcity from offering full service, or having to employ those with insufficient qualifications for the work.[16]

Such ideas have been translated into action in studies on current awareness found in the literature. None of these stressed printed reference material in relation to faculty use per se. They did, however, move in the direction of close cooperation with faculty members. Harris reported a study in which four librarians were matched to work closely with four faculty members, one from each of the departments of religion, history, government, and biology, to provide course materials for the students of the faculty members cooperating.[17] Johnson, King, and Mavor worked out a plan for a "switching center" at Hamline University under which a librarian was to work with a faculty member toward course material for his class work.[18] Emphasis in this study seemed to be on the proper utilization of the interview encounter and the ability on the part of the librarian to supply the expressed informational need. Dougherty reported a successful delivery service for documents which served the faculty, administration, graduate assistants, librarians, and students at the University of Colorado. The faculty became actively involved in making requests from the library; in fact, they represented 79 per cent of the users and in the first 18 months 33 1/3 per cent of the total faculty had used the service at least once.[19] A last study influential in setting the direction of this one was one done in England at the University of Bath and reported by Evans and Line. Here two young information officers, two women--one trained in sociology and the other in librarianship--undertook successively and then ultimately as a team to provide information service to social science researchers. Their method was to search through abstracting and indexing tools, primary journals, publishers' notices, reviews, BNB, and _Current Contents_ before shelving these works in order to locate items of interest to the researchers. The resulting items of information were distributed individually according to faculty profile or collectively through a circulated bulletin. Their study was concerned with many variables and they established very good rapport with the social scientists they served. It is worth noting that, despite the faculty-librarian controversy indicated in some of the previous studies, a current awareness program was productively maintained in this one for two and one-half years, at the end of which time the faculty they served reported that they had become more "purposeful" library users.[20]

All of the professional literature and studies reported above tend to lead to the present study. The findings of Knapp's experimental study would seem to imply that faculty use the usual materials through a different approach or use different materials with the same or a different approach than librarians do. De Hart's, Nelson's and Schumacher's studies reveal a faculty use and approach to materials that are not well understood. Lehman suggests the most likely route to the climate in which discovery can be made about faculty habits of library use. The work reported by Harris and that by Johnson, King, and Mavor point up ways to travel that route through mutual cooperation which yields not only better service to one class of patrons (students), but also dialogue and understanding that unconsciously uncover faculty needs and approaches to reference, research, and resource materials. Hall is pragmatically aware of what Knapp's findings mean to library or information service. Dougherty moves from Hall's pragmatic theory into library-initiated action and finds that, if the library wants increased faculty use, it can have it.

The present study bears some relationship to the above studies in that it shares with them (1) the faculty as subjects and (2) in some measure, faculty information needs. While these studies and the articles mentioned above speak to the difference between faculty and library approaches to reference and (by implication) to the unknown nature of faculty use of library materials, or to the necessity or to the methods of modifying the library-academic environment to that in which something can be learned about faculty use or needs, practically nothing is known about the preferential habits of faculty use of current reference works. This study specifically investigates the relationship between faculty knowledge of current reference and para-reference works and faculty use of them.

CHAPTER III

THE POPULATION AND THE METHOD

The population and the method of this study were selected with a view of the exploratory nature of the investigation, the nature of the problem being explored, and the possible sensitivities of the group being studied.

The Population

The faculty of the Department of Speech at Ball State University were selected as a sample faculty population for this study for five reasons:

(1) The investigator had some, although limited, knowledge of the field.

(2) The structure of the department was understood.

(3) Through prior observation, the investigator anticipated the cooperation of this group.

(4) For the purposes of this study this selection of faculty was considered a good sample. The particular range of subject matter in this department is from the arts as represented by the area of drama through the social sciences as represented by the area of general speech to the sciences as represented by speech pathology and audiology. Taken together, these areas present a sweep of disciplinary interests somewhat microcosmically representative of the

intellectual concerns of the total academic institution.

(5) The members of this department are productive, intellectually active, and involved by necessity with current information. A number of them have written texts, some more than one, and even a larger number have been involved in publishing through journals. One of the group is the editor of an international journal for speech pathology. Another has delivered a paper to an international phonetics conference and attends such conferences fairly regularly. A third has, within the year of the study, been selected as the National Debate Coach of the Year. The general speech area has produced national winning speech teams for some time and is exceedingly active. The area [illegible] speech pathology and audiology is accredited by the American Speech and Hearing Association, maintains an active out-patient clinic with summer boarding experience for children, and has recognized expert clinicians guiding its work. The area of theater supports an active winter program of five to six stage productions and approximately nine experimental stage productions. During the summer this area carries out a summer theater program which is usually comprised of two musicals and three comedies. The scope of its interest as educational theater is from classical to ultra-modern. For all of its productions, dramatic and technical research is done.

The composition of the department in terms of numbers of faculty in each area, graduate degrees held, faculty ranks represented, and distribution by sex is as follows:

(1) Administrative Head of Department: This member is a speech generalist with a special interest and proficiency in phonetics. He holds a doctorate degree and the rank of professor. While he maintains an interest in the activities of the area of general speech and has extensive background and accomplishments in that area, he now shares his academic interests with administrative responsibilities which are considerable.

(2) The area of speech pathology and audiology has ten members. Four of these hold doctorates, two have completed all work toward it but the dissertation, one has done approximately one year beyond the master's degree, and three hold masters' degrees. Two of the three holding masters' degrees are temporary teachers. Within the area there are two professors, one associate professor, five assistant professors, and two instructors. The area has seven men and three women faculty members.

(3) The area of general speech has seven members. Three of these hold doctorates, one has completed all work toward it except the dissertation, one has completed one year beyond the master's degree, and two hold masters' degrees. There are one professor, one associate professor, three assistant professors, and two instructors. The area has four men and three women faculty members.

(4) The area of theater has eight members. Five of these hold the doctorate, one lacks only the doctoral

dissertation, one has completed one year beyond the master's degree and one holds a master's degree. There are two professors, four associate professors, and two instructors. The area has seven men and one woman.

The total department is composed of 26 faculty members. This number represents 3.34 per cent of the 779 teaching faculty within the whole university. Of the 26 members, 13 hold doctorates, 4 have completed all doctoral work except their dissertations, 4 have done work beyond the master's degree and 8 hold masters' degrees. There are 6 professors, 6 associate professors, 8 assistant professors and 6 instructors. The total department has 19 men and 7 women.

The Methodology

The design of the study required four steps for obtaining the desired data:

(1) The selection of the data to be obtained: The purpose of the study required data which would show the extent of faculty use of current reference and para-reference works and the extent of their knowledge of them. In order to provide some basic reference standard, it was necessary to obtain data on the extent to which the sample population used ongoing abstracts, bibliographies, indexes, newer editions of older works, and basically established works in the subject field. Needed also were titles which they had used but which the investigator did not offer for identification. For

qualitative measurement, it was necessary to obtain information on faculty reference needs, attitudes, and habits.

(2) The selection of reference and para-reference titles: Titles to be included on the questionnaires were selected by the following criteria--(a) the title must apply to one of the three subject fields of the department or, for Questionnaire A, to the work of the general department, (b) it must have been held by the Ball State University Library for the time period studied, and (c) for Questionnaire A, it must have been shelved originally before 1970; for Questionnaire B, it must have been shelved after January 1, 1970.

Over 200 titles were inspected out of which 52 were chosen for Questionnaire A and 67 for the four forms of Questionnaire B. These were selected through searching the card catalogue, consulting Walford and Winchell, consulting reference personnel about specific titles, and making a personal judgment of the appropriateness of some items.

The most difficult aspect of the selection was obtaining the current list. Many titles which were excellent were second editions or altered versions of earlier works, sometimes with titles different from the original title, sometimes with a different first author. Some titles which were excellent were not held by the library or had not yet been shelved for use. The compiled list was a compromise but a practical list of some breadth. It was further shortened by the deletion of current titles which had been shelved too recently for proper faculty exposure--a fact undetected in a few instances until after the questionnaire had been administered, at which time each volume was checked for shelving date. The results of that check altered the emphasis put on certain titles as did the discovery that some titles with earlier editions had made the final list. In critical comparisons of data, these were excluded.

(3) The construction of a set of questionnaires: A set of two questionnaires was devised to obtain both quantitative and qualitative responses regarding current reference works.

Questionnaire A. The first questionnaire was a three-page checklist (see Appendix) of older, established, re-edited, or ongoing reference works judged to be specifically of interest to those in the subject area of speech. Titles were entered here by categories of works: abstracts, bibliographies, collections, current surveys, directories, encyclopedias and dictionaries, handbooks and manuals, history and illustration, indexes, and statistics. The number of entries in the categories varied from three to seven. The numbers of entries specifically related to each of the areas in the department also varied: 5 entries pertained to speech pathology and audiology (but it was anticipated that additional general items would be of high importance to the faculty of that area), 26 items pertained specifically to general speech, and 16 items pertained to the area of theater. Six items were general items which seemed likely to pertain to all faculty of the department, although not necessarily to the same degree. All together, 52 reference titles were submitted. In each category, provision was made for the faculty members to submit other titles which they had used in the last five years but which did not appear on the questionnaire. Informed by a short paragraph of instructions, the faculty were to identify the items under each category which they had used or recommended for students' use in the last five years. The questionnaire was planned to obtain the reference titles used in each area of the department, the proportion of reference titles actually used from the list to the number appearing on the list, the titles which were heavily used, and the titles which the respondents had used outside their own special area but in the general field of speech. It also permitted them to indicate their own specific profile of reference works through their added titles.

Questionnaire B. The second questionnaire was designed to measure current reference use and knowledge in a quantitative way (Part I) and current reference needs, attitudes, and habits in a qualitative way (Part II) (see Appendix).

Part I had four forms: one for the administrative head who has a specialty in phonetics and one each for the three areas of the department. In length the forms varied from one page to three. In each of the four forms the questionnaire consisted of a list of current reference titles judged by the investigator to apply specifically to the particular area in question and to serve that group as a reference or para-reference work. The questionnaire contained a list of reference works to the right of which were three columns labeled with headings, each of which showed increasing knowledge of the book: Do Not Know, Know But Have Not Used, and Have Used for the Following Purpose(s). The first two columns were designed for checking; the third was given more space for remarks about use. The books were entered by author and title only in the belief that if a faculty member had used a book that would be sufficient reminder. Part I was devised to obtain information that could be used in a comparison with the information from Questionnaire A, but also to yield from its own intercolumnar relationships information regarding the relationship of current knowledge and use.

Part II of Questionnaire B consisted of one form of nine questions occupying two pages. Each question provided for a yes, no, or a possible multiple selection check, and space for added comments. Five of the nine questions specifically urged comment and the instructional sentence prefacing the form requested comment wherever possible. This form inquired into the faculty member's need for reference, his habits and preferences regarding reference works, the access and the adequacy of such reference sources, the adequacy of the methods by which he was informed about reference materials, his preferences in reference assistance, his priorities, his opinion as to the relevancy of the standard list (Questionnaire A), and the comparative usefulness of the two lists to his work.

(4) The administering of the questionnaires: The first questionnaire was sent to each faculty member on April 5 with a cover letter (see Appendix) stating the purpose of the study. Returns were requested by April 10. It was intended to send out the second questionnaire during the next week. However, some returns were not made until the second week after the date requested. A follow-up personal note was sent to those persons whose returns were not forthcoming, and in an instance or two it was necessary to follow this by a phone call.

The second questionnaire was sent on April 22 and returns were made by May 9. The same follow-up process was begun and would have been carried out, but the returns of Questionnaire B came with one or two exceptions quite voluntarily.

A code number consisting of a letter and a number was assigned each faculty member. This code number assisted in recovering returns, and it helped to match the two questionnaires returned by an individual faculty member.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents an analysis of the data received in the two questionnaires submitted to the 26 respondents described in the last chapter. These data will be applied to a number of questions regarding faculty use of reference materials, and ultimately and most importantly, to the question of faculty use of current reference materials. The data from Questionnaire A will be analyzed to determine the kind and the extent of the use of older, standard reference titles applicable to the work of the department, the reach of the respondents' use into areas of the department other than their own, and the nature of the titles which the groups volunteered. The data from Part I of Questionnaire B will be analyzed to determine whether or not the faculty members polled know the current reference and para-reference titles submitted to them and to what extent they use them. The data from Questionnaire A and Part I of Questionnaire B will be compared to determine the relationship between the faculty use of older standard reference books and their use of current reference books in order to arrive at a meaningful statement of their use of current reference books. Information from Part II of Questionnaire B will be analyzed to determine what the respondents' needs and attitudes toward current reference literature and services are, how relevant the applicable titles of Questionnaire A are to the work of the specialized areas of speech pathology and audiology, general speech, and theater, and how useful the faculty considers current reference books of the library collection.

Returns of Questionnaires A and B were received from 24 members of the department of 26 members for a rate of return of 92.31 per cent. From the separate areas of the department, the questionnaires were returned as follows: From speech pathology and audiology, 9 of 10 (90 per cent); from general speech, 7 of 7 (100 per cent); from theater, 7 of 8 (87.50 per cent), and from the head of the department, whose area is phonetics, 1 of 1 (100 per cent). One of these returns, that of the head of the department, fell into a class of one and seemed both statistically extreme and insufficiently anonymous to use in a discussion of Questionnaire B. Consequently, his response to Questionnaire A was also dropped so that an equal number of respondents were represented in matching data from both forms. However, the qualitative responses of this respondent to Questionnaire B, Part II, were used to give the maximum weight to faculty opinion through the largest possible sample.

Analysis of Data Gathered from Questionnaire A

Questionnaire A (see Appendix), described in Chapter III, contained 52 reference titles. Its primary purpose was (1) to obtain data applying to the questions above, but it was also meant (2) to break down any possible faculty opposition to response by presenting the selected respondents with presumably familiar reference titles before they encountered the second list in Part I of Questionnaire B, a list of titles believed to be less familiar to them, and (3) to elicit from them additional titles which they might have used in the last five years (the period of use which the questionnaire examined). This first questionnaire was devised from titles (1) in the library, (2) regarded as reference sources especially useful to the Department of Speech, and (3) first edited and shelved before January 1, 1970. It had potential problems deriving from its multipurposes, its criteria, and the small number of titles selected for the area of speech pathology and audiology. It was reasonably well-balanced in entries within categories, but it was unbalanced in terms of specialized area offerings: 5 in speech pathology and audiology, 26 in general speech, and 16 in theater. There were an additional 6 general items believed applicable to all areas. These general items, however, were especially applicable to the area of speech pathology and audiology and made a total of 11 items offered to that group of respondents. In considering the data, it will be useful to keep the proportion of titles in mind.

It is perhaps important to note in relation to the proportions of titles in Questionnaire A that the investigator had been led to believe that the members of the department under study were, all in all, likely to be generalists.

Consequently, the composition of the questionnaire was made on that assumption and equal area offerings did not seem so vital. However, a means of correction for errors of omission was provided by the request that the respondents supply additional reference titles which they had used in the last five years but which did not appear on the questionnaire.

The titles in Questionnaire A were listed by reference-type categories: abstracts, bibliographies, collections, current surveys, directories, encyclopedias and dictionaries, handbooks and manuals, history and illustration, indexes, and statistics. Table 1 presents a summary of the percentage of titles used in each reference-type category by each specialized group of respondents in the general department of speech as those titles were sub-categorized into (1) area titles, (2) general titles and area titles combined, and (3) all titles--with and without the added titles volunteered by each of the three groups in each of the reference-source categories. In all, then, six different percentages of use are expressed for each of the Groups A, B, and C: (1) the percentage of use of area titles, (2) the percentage of use of area titles with volunteered titles added, (3) the percentage of use of general titles and area titles considered together, (4) the percentage of use of general titles and area titles considered together with volunteered titles added, (5) the percentage of use of all titles (including titles in other areas of the department other than the respondent's own), and (6) the percentage of use of all

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF TITLES USED IN EACH CATEGORY OF QUESTIONNAIRE A BY EACH GROUP

Group & Category	Abs.	Bibl.	Collec- tions	Current Surveys	Direc- tories	Ency. & Dict.	Hdbks. & Manuals	Hist. & Illus.	Indexes	Statis- tics	Total
Group A											
All Titles	44.44	1.85	1.85	0.00	11.11	12.70	0.00	0.00	1.59	3.17	7.69
All Titles + Vol.	34.92	3.17	3.17	0.00	22.22	12.35	9.52	0.00	5.56	3.17	9.93
Gen. + Area	44.44	5.56	0.00	0.00	16.67	88.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.32
Gen. + Area + Vol.	34.92	7.41	0.00	0.00	27.28	37.04	18.52	0.00	14.81	0.00	25.60
Area Only	66.67	5.56	0.00	0.00	22.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33
Area + Vol.	38.89	7.41	0.00	0.00	33.33	11.11	27.78	0.00	16.67	0.00	24.31
Group B											
All Titles	22.86	19.05	30.95	38.10	14.29	14.29	25.00	0.00	24.49	22.45	21.15
All Titles + Vol.	22.86	14.29	30.95	38.10	14.29	14.29	22.86	0.00	24.49	22.45	20.66
Gen. + Area	38.10	38.10	34.29	38.10	14.29	28.57	42.86	0.00	35.71	22.45	31.25
Gen. + Area + Vol.	38.10	28.57	34.29	38.10	14.29	25.00	33.33	0.00	35.71	22.45	29.37
Area Only	0.00	38.10	34.29	38.10	0.00	28.57	71.43	0.00	35.71	22.45	31.87
Area + Vol.	0.00	28.57	34.29	38.10	0.00	28.57	42.86	0.00	35.71	22.45	30.05
Group C											
All Titles	25.71	14.29	19.05	4.76	38.10	30.61	50.00	50.00	22.45	8.16	24.73
All Titles + Vol.	25.71	15.48	18.37	4.76	22.22	24.68	42.86	28.57	20.63	8.93	21.34
Gen. + Area	33.33	35.71	14.29	0.00	50.00	37.14	47.62	61.90	47.62	0.00	42.86
Gen. + Area + Vol.	33.33	21.43	14.29	0.00	23.21	26.98	47.62	30.16	34.29	14.29	27.68
Area Only	0.00	35.71	14.29	0.00	85.71	28.57	64.29	61.90	47.62	0.00	46.43
Area + Vol.	0.00	20.41	14.29	0.00	38.10	25.71	64.29	30.16	39.29	14.29	29.87

titles with volunteered titles added.

The percentage figure of titles used was obtained by dividing the number of respondent uses of area, general, or total titles with and without volunteered titles in any reference-type category (that is, abstracts, bibliographies, etc.) by the greatest number of possible uses the total number of titles in that category might obtain from the respondents of the group under study or, in cases of total department use, from the total number of department respondents. In Group A, for example, there were two speech pathology and audiology abstracts listed. There were 12 reported uses of either of these abstracts. In all, each abstract might have been checked by nine respondents (the total number in the speech pathology and audiology area). The percentage of area use of abstracts was obtained by the equation: $12 \div (9 \times 2) = 66.67$ per cent.

Group A. As the figures in the table indicate, Group A showed a pattern of use not completely corresponding to the presence or absence of area items in the reference-type categories. Where area items were more numerous, heavier use might have been expected. Such was not uniformly true. Of the five abstract titles listed in Questionnaire A, two were speech pathology and audiology abstracts and three were general abstracts but with high applicability to the interests of speech pathology and audiology. The category of bibliographies contained two area items, that of directories included one area and one general title, that of encyclopedias contained one general title, and so did the category of handbooks and manuals. The categories of collections, current surveys, history and illustration, and statistics contained no general or area titles. The use of titles by Group A (speech pathology and audiology) was greatest, 66.67 per cent, in the category of abstracts, the category in which the greatest number of applicable titles were offered. The next greatest use indicated was of directories, 22.22 per cent. The percentage of bibliographies used was extremely low, 5.56 per cent, even though applicable titles were included in the category. No other use of area titles in any category occurred.

When volunteered titles were added to the area titles, the highest percentage of area use by Group A was in the category of abstracts, 38.89 per cent, followed closely by the 33.33 per cent use of directories, then the 27.70 per cent use of handbooks and manuals, and the much lower 16.67 per cent use of indexes. The 11.11 per cent use of encyclopedias and dictionaries indicated by the respondents does not seem to suggest their importance as reference tools for this group. The most puzzling figure was that for the category of bibliographies. Neither the percentage of used questionnaire titles, 5.56 per cent, nor the slightly increased use of bibliographies when volunteered titles were added, 7.41 per cent, appear to indicate much group reliance upon them. No titles were offered on the questionnaire and no use was indicated by volunteered-area titles in the categories of collections, current surveys, history and illustration, or statistics.

For Group A, outside of those titles for the area, some percentages of use seem high when compared to the generally quite low percentages of the remaining categories. The general-and-area use combined for the category of encyclopedias and dictionaries was a high 88.89 per cent, but this was affected by one title which had almost unanimous use. The degree to which that book was used produced the percentage of use; yet the texture of use was not nearly so rich as the use of general-and-area titles with volunteered titles added in the category of abstracts. There, a total of 22 uses of 6 titles provided a 34.92 per cent rate of usage but more exposure of more abstracts to members of the area than was the case with encyclopedias and dictionaries. General-and-area use of bibliographies was the same as area use alone, 5.56 per cent, because there were no general titles in the category of bibliographies to change it. The 16.67 per cent general-and-area use of directories was the result of the group's lack of use of the Education Directory. Perhaps the most significant class of titles to be observed were those of the general-and-area titles with volunteered titles added. The contributions which they submitted indicated a 37.04 per cent use of listed and volunteered titles in the category of encyclopedias and dictionaries, followed by a 34.92 per cent use in that of abstracts, a 27.28 per cent use in directories, an 18.52 per cent in handbooks and manuals, a 14.81 per cent use in indexes, and a 7.41 per cent use in bibliographies. The lack of titles in the three categories in area titles which contain no percentages of use and the six in area titles with volunteered titles added or the five in general-and-area titles with volunteered titles added suggests limitations in the measuring instrument for Group A.

Any duplicate volunteered titles such as the seven listings of the two very specific and practical directories--the _American Speech and Hearing Association Directory_ and the _Indiana Hearing Aid Specialists Association Directory_--probably reflect the homogeneity of interest of this group. In the case of these titles, it is the strong referral service given by clinicians in the area of speech pathology and audiology. In the category of handbooks and manuals, the volunteered title of Jack Katz' _Handbook of Audiology_ and the four-times-mentioned Travis' _Handbook of Speech Pathology_ point to the specialized interest of the group. The failure of the members of the group to submit titles in all those categories with 0.00 per cent of use may suggest something of the narrow shape of the reference literature of speech pathology and audiology.

Of the 14 different titles suggested by the respondents in Group A, 10 were area references, 2 were in some measure general, and 2 were in another area of speech. Nineteen of the 22 submissions of these titles (including duplicate listings) or 86.36 per cent of the submissions were pertinent to the area of speech pathology and audiology.

In summary then, the use indicated by Group A of the somewhat limited list of categorized titles in Questionnaire A tended to be rather spotty. Even when volunteered titles were considered with the area titles, reference literature seemed to cluster heavily in abstracts and directories, somewhat less heavily in handbooks and manuals, indexes, encyclopedias and dictionaries, and bibliographies in that order, and to be unrepresented in current surveys, history and illustration, and statistics. When considered together, (1) the high rate of duplicate volunteered titles (57.14 per cent), (2) the large number of individual volunteered titles which are titles of interest only to this area, and as noted above, (3) the almost unanimous use of the title in the category of encyclopedias and dictionaries would seem to indicate a group with homogenous reference needs and narrowly specialized interests.

Group B. The 26 sources for the area of general speech were distributed in the questionnaire in varying degrees of concentration. The titles in the categories of collections, current surveys, and statistics were directed toward the activities of this area. There were five area titles in collections, three in current surveys, and seven in statistics. For the latter two categories, these titles comprised the entire offering. The titles in the categories of bibliographies, encyclopedias and dictionaries, handbooks and manuals, and indexes were well-balanced with those of other areas. There were three area titles in bibliographies, two area titles and one general title in encyclopedias and dictionaries, one area and one general title in handbooks and manuals, and four area titles in indexes. Area titles were few in the categories of abstracts, directories, and history and illustration in contrast to the presence of the titles of other areas. There were three general titles with no great applicability to the area of general speech in the category of abstracts, one general title in directories, and one area title in history and illustration.

In those categories in which the titles directed toward the work of general speech were numerous, light to moderate use was indicated. The respondents' use of area titles in surveys was 38.10 per cent; in collections a slightly lower 34.29 per cent; and their use of statistical reference sources was a surprising 22.45 per cent. Higher use of reference sources for statistics might have been expected because of the reference needs of debate alone. In those categories where the choices were fewer--that is, where the titles represented the work of all areas of the department--the rate of use of area titles by Group B was roughly comparable to, or higher than, the percentages cited above. In bibliographies, use of area titles was 38.10 per cent; in indexes it was 35.71 per cent; in encyclopedias and dictionaries, 28.57 per cent; but in handbooks and manuals it was 71.43 per cent. This high percentage of use was the result of the group's heavy use of Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. The percentage of use of indexes represented a distribution of use among four area titles, but the percentage of use of bibliographies was derived from fairly heavy use of two bibliographies and the failure to indicate any use of another. In this case, the inclusion of a title adjudged pertinent but checked by no one reduced the percentage of the use of the other 2 from 57.14 per cent to 38.10 per cent for the 3. (Such situations underline the absolute necessity of an informed selection of the titles which are submitted in the questionnaire forms if the study should ever be made on larger scale.) In those categories where the area titles were very few, the percentage of use dropped dramatically. In 2 of the categories, of necessity it was 0.00 per cent, for no area titles were included. In history and illustration it was 0.00 per cent, although 1 area item was offered. The respondents of Group B used the area titles in those categories whose titles were well-distributed among the three areas of speech as much or more than they did those in those categories where the greater number of titles were directed toward speech. In general, their use of the 26 titles pertaining to their work can be characterized as moderate or light.

The respondents of this group did not elect to volunteer many specific titles. They listed only four--each only once. Two of these were journals volunteered in the category of bibliography: The Quarterly Journal of Speech and Speech Monographs. One was the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The fourth was Coger and White's Reader's Theatre Handbook.

The respondents did, however, note using certain unnamed bibliographies relating to various debate topics, and they said that they compiled their own bibliographies on certain topics. Indexes, statistical sources, surveys, and directories were treated in the same way. As a result of their single-respondent volunteering of so few titles, the percentage of usage of area titles with volunteered titles added was lower than the percentage of use of area titles alone. In those categories having area titles, the largest drop was in handbooks and manuals, where the single title submitted by only 1 person reduced the percentage of use from 71.43 per cent to 42.86 per cent (because the total number of possible respondents for the area was increased by 7 while the number of titles was increased by 1). The use of bibliographies fell from 38.10 to 28.57 per cent. Since there were no area titles volunteered in abstracts, collections, current surveys, directories, history and illustration, indexes, and statistics, the percentages remained the same as for the area titles. The most remarkable feature of the volunteered response of this group was the small number of specific titles which they named.

When the use of general items and area items are considered together, the faculty of general speech indicated little change in use. On the questionnaire form, they indicated 12 uses in all of the 6 general items. Eight of these uses were of general abstracts and account for the largest positive change for the group, from 0.00 per cent to

38.10 per cent. In the category of handbooks and manuals the very high percentage of use of 71.43 per cent tumbled to 42.86 per cent; in directories it moved from 0.00 per cent to 14.29 per cent. All other scores remained the same.

In this questionnaire, the use of older, standard, or more established sources was highest for Group B in handbooks and manuals, collections, current surveys, indexes, bibliographies, and general abstracts. Except for one almost unanimously used item, this use did not exceed 50 per cent and frequently was below it. The least-used category of reference sources was that of history and illustration. Yet outside this category, there were few instances of no use, and the group was characterized by a widespread need for sources. That the highest percentage of usage was in collections, current surveys, indexes, bibliographies, and general abstracts probably points up their involvement in current issues. That handbooks and manuals were also included in this highest-use group is perhaps a reflection of the how-to function of such books in the group's development of speakers and their instruction in the conduct of meetings.

Group C. The 16 area items for the respondents in the area of theater were distributed in all but 3 categories and in one of these the 3 general items that had some application to the area offered additional opportunity to indicate use. The distribution of items placed three general items in abstracts, two area titles in bibliographies, one area title in collections, one area and one general title in directories, four area titles and one general title in encyclopedia and dictionaries, two area titles and one general title in handbooks and manuals, three area titles in history and illustration, and three area titles in indexes.

For Group C the percentage of use of area titles was highest in the category of directories in which there was only one area title but almost unanimous use. Six of the 7 members, 85.71 per cent, used *Simon's Directory of Theatrical Materials, Services, and Information*. The categories of handbooks and manuals had a very strong 64.29 per cent of use, and history and illustration had a similarly strong 61.90 per cent of use. The 9 uses of the 2 handbooks and manuals and the 13 uses of the 3 area titles of history and illustration indicated that over one-half of this group, or 57.14 per cent, used each of these books, and in the case of Nicoll's *The Development of the Theatre* and Lounsbury's *The Theatre Backstage from A to Z*, 5 of the 7 responding members of the area or 71.43 per cent reported its use. The category of indexes showed a smaller but strong 47.62 per cent of use. The category of bibliographies had a moderate use of 35.71 per cent of the 2 titles with Baker's *Theatre and Allied Arts: A Guide* preferred to Roach's *Spoken Records* 4 to 1. Despite the fact that there were 4 area titles and that the 10 uses were almost evenly distributed among them, the category of encyclopedias and dictionaries had a reasonably light use of 28.57 per cent. Collections had almost no use, 14.29 per cent, but there was only 1 area title listed in the category.

In the categories of abstracts, current surveys, and statistics, no use could be registered for there were no area titles. This group had a very strong area showing which was distributed over many kinds of reference sources in varying degrees. Questionnaire response indicated strengths of unaniminity of use of one title and the concentrated use of several offered titles. Both practical and subject-matter-directed titles were checked as important to the group. Since these respondents are both teachers and producers, this is understandable.

Group C volunteered 27 titles, more than either of the other groups. There was only 1 duplication of a title for a total of 28 listings. These volunteered titles fell into eight of the ten categories of titles presented in Questionnaire A. The group failed to volunteer titles only in the categories of abstracts and current surveys. Of the titles which these respondents volunteered, 18 were area titles, 9 were general reference titles either applicable to the department or to the general academic community, and 1 was a title for another area of speech. The volunteered other-area manual title, Roberts' Rules of Order, probably can be explained by the fact that some members of the theater area sometimes teach a class of public speaking. When the volunteered titles were added to the area titles, the percentage of use for this group dropped sharply, reflecting the highly individual listing of volunteer titles. Handbooks and manuals, however, had a 64.29 per cent use because the volunteered manual was in another area. Two added index titles decreased the percentage of use in that category to 39.29 per cent. The category of directories with 2 added area titles was reduced to a use of 38.10 per cent. That of history and illustration with 6 added titles fell to 30.16 per cent of use. With the addition of 1 title, the use of encyclopedias and dictionaries fell to 25.71 per cent. In bibliographies there was the addition of 1 area title and a resulting lower use of 20.41 per cent. The category of statistics gained an area title in Variety for a use of 14.29 per cent. The categories of abstracts and of current surveys were totally unaffected by volunteered titles since they received none. While Group A with 9 respondents produced 14 separate volunteered titles with 8 duplications, Group C produced 27 titles with 1 duplication. Whether this difference is accounted for by a more humanistic orientation on the part of the theater respondents or by their more creative individuality, a trait generally accredited to the area of theater, is not answered by the data at hand. The difference in pattern of use did raise area percentages when volunteered titles were included for Group A and in general lowered them for Group C.

An examination of general titles and area titles considered together for the area of theater does not show remarkable change in percentage of use. The category of abstracts, influenced by 7 uses of the 3 general abstracts, showed an increase of use from 0.00 per cent to 33.33 per cent.

Use in the category of encyclopedias and dictionaries, modified by the group's heavy use of the general title, Kenyon and Knott's A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English, increased from 28.57 per cent to 37.14 per cent. Use in the category of directories was reduced from 85.71 per cent to 50.00 per cent when only 1 person in the group indicated the use of the general Education Directory. Use in the category of handbooks and manuals decreased from 64.29 per cent to 47.62 per cent when only 1 respondent indicated use of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. All other percentages remained constant.

Through the patterns of use revealed by this questionnaire, Group C might be characterized as using a wide variety of reference works, both practical and academic. According to the percentages of use and the clustering of raw scores, they would seem to have indicated the use of a common core of several reference sources. This commonality of use appeared to occur in several aspects of their work--voice and diction, practical aspects of theater, research, and organizational interests. Yet, in terms of the individuality of the titles which they volunteered, they appeared to be a group of individuals with unique reference needs within their special area. This individuality of reference needs which seemed to be indicated may imply that each member of the group has an area of responsibility within the area to which responsibility he is constant, or it may mean that these faculty members approach reference in a creative way. A more thorough investigation of the many variables is needed.

Table 1 presents three other percentages of use for Groups A, B, and C; namely, (1) general-and-area titles combined with volunteered titles in both added, (2) all titles, and (3) all titles and volunteered titles. The main thrust of this study is not advanced, however, by a detailed analysis of these subcategories. Consequently, despite some interesting variations in percentages, analysis of these classes of titles will not be made in this report. A comparison of the table and Questionnaire A with the list of volunteered titles (located in the Appendix) will, on the basis of previous analyses of percentages, explain any percentage which might attract the interest of the reader.

Table 2 presents a comparison of the total usage of older, more established reference titles by the three groups. Summarized are the percentages of the use of titles applicable to (1) area work, (2) general department work, (3) a combination of area and general work, (4) the work of other areas of the department other than the respondents' own, as well as (5) the percentage of use of all the titles in Questionnaire A. The percentage of use of reference titles by department is included.

Comparison of the Use of Older, More Established Reference Titles by Groups A, B, and C. Of the three groups, in terms of use of area titles, Group C with 16 area title possibilities had the highest percentage of use, 46.43 per cent. Group B with 26 area title possibilities had the

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGE OF USE BY EACH GROUP AND BY THE DEPARTMENT, LISTED BY TITLE APPLICABILITY

Title Applicability By Area	Percentage of Total Use	
	Questionnaire Titles Only	Respondent-Volunteered Titles Included
Group A: SPAA		
Area	33.33	24.31
General	31.48	28.57
General and Area	32.32	25.60
Other	1.08	1.32
Total	7.69	9.93
Group B: General Speech		
Area	31.87	30.05
General	28.57	26.53
General and Area	31.25	29.37
Other	5.00	5.00
Total	21.15	20.66
Group C: Theater		
Area	46.43	29.87
General	33.33	22.86
General and Area	42.86	27.68
Other	11.43	11.52
Total	24.73	21.34
Department (Combined)		
Area	36.87	28.25
General	31.16	25.35
General and Area	35.22	27.47
Other	4.87	5.11
Total	16.97	16.70

lowest percentage of use, 31.87 per cent. Group A with only 5 area title possibilities had the median percentage of use, 33.33 per cent. The 2 groups with the higher number of area possibilities, Groups B and C, had the largest difference in percentage of use, 14.55 percentage points. Between Group C and Group A there was a great difference in the number of area titles offered in the questionnaire, but there was a difference in the percentage of area title use of only 13.10 percentage points, 1.45 points less than that between Groups B and C.

When volunteered titles were computed with the area titles, Group B, the group with the least percentage of use without the added titles, was the group with the highest percentage of use within this second class of titles, 30.05 per cent, or 1.82 percentage points less than the group's use of questionnaire-listed area titles only. Group C was the median group with a percentage of use of 29.87 per cent for a drop of 16.56 percentage points. Group A had 24.31 per cent of use of the titles in this class for a loss of 9.02 percentage points. The small loss, 1.82 percentage points, experienced by Group B resulted from the very few volunteered titles which its members submitted. Group C showed the greatest drop, 16.56 percentage points, as a result of its highly individualistic volunteering of titles (that is, single titles volunteered by single faculty members). Group A experienced a smaller drop than Group C because of the greater number of duplicate volunteered titles which Group A offered.

The general title use by the three groups had much less variation. Group C had the highest use, 33.33 per cent; Group A had the next highest use, 31.48 per cent (1.85 percentage points less than Group C); and Group B had the lowest use, 28.57 per cent (4.76 percentage points less than Group C and 2.91 points less than A). None of these percentages of use was high, but together they represented 43 instances of use distributed among the 6 general titles by 23 respondents. These general titles were affected by volunteered titles. With them, Group A had the highest percentage of use, 28.57 per cent for a loss of 2.91 percentage points. Group B has the second highest percentage of use, 26.53 per cent for a loss of 2.04 percentage points. Group C has the lowest percentage of use, 22.86 per cent, for a loss of 10.47 percentage points. The greater loss of Group C occurred because the members of that group submitted three times the number of general items than the members of the other groups, and each title was submitted by only one respondent.

In an examination of general-and-area titles combined, Group C had the highest percentage of use, 42.86 per cent, Group A had 32.32 per cent, and Group B had 31.25 per cent. The total range of difference among the groups was 11.61 percentage points. Group A and Group B had nearly the same amount of use (32.32 per cent and 31.25 per cent) and revealed only a little less use than they indicated for area titles only (1.01 and 0.62 percentage points respectively). The most significant fact emerging from this comparison of general and area scores for the three groups was the much higher percentage of use of these combined general and area titles by Group C than the percentage of use by either of the other two.

The faculty use of those references most clearly applicable to other areas of the department (listed in the table as other) has not yet been examined. As revealed in Table 2, Group C had an 11.43 per cent use of other-area sources. This amount of use was over twice as great as the 5 per cent of use indicated by Group B and over 10 times as great as the 1.08 per cent indicated by Group A. The explanation of the difference may be surmised to lie, at least in part, (1) in the specialized and uninterchangeable work of speech pathology and audiology (Group A) and (2) in the occasional class taught in the general speech area (area of Group B) by the theater staff (Group C); (3) an added factor is the nature of the training of a number of the faculty in the area of theater. At least three, and possibly four, received their training in speech at a time when they were likely to be prepared as generalists before becoming specialists. Their associations and experiences subsequent to that training may have kept alive an active interest in other areas of the field.

The total percentage of use of titles for each group (the fifth percentage listed in the table for each) is the percentage of all 52 titles in the questionnaire which the group has used. Since the base was thus broadened and since none of them could be expected to use as many titles from other areas as from their own, the percentages of use were much smaller. Group C's total use was 24.75 per cent of all titles, Group B's was 21.15 per cent, and Group A's was 7.69 per cent. Here the design of the questionnaire militated against any possibly high percentage of use by Group A. Group C emerged as the group most widely conversant with the reference literature of the other groups.

When the areas were considered together as 1 department, then the use of area titles was 36.87 per cent, the use of general titles was 31.16 per cent, and combined use of general and area titles was 35.22 per cent, and the use of other area titles was 4.87 per cent. The total of all the combined instances of use divided by the greatest possible number of uses in the department was 16.97 per cent.

A consideration of the effect of respondent-volunteered titles on the general-and-area, other, and total class use would provide no useful expansion of the discussion of the data from Questionnaire A for the central purposes of this study. Those effects may be observed from Table 2, but will not be further treated here.

In the preceding discussion an effort has been made to try to report inadequacies and possible inadquacies of Questionnaire A at the point at which they might easily be shown to affect the interpretation of data. This effort may have given the impression that the measuring instrument was very ineffective indeed. It had many flaws, but faculty reaction to the measuring quality of the instrument itself in Part II of Questionnaire B supported its reasonable effectiveness. How effective it was can also be partially judged from a summary of the responses made by the faculty of the three groups in the separate categories of titles which it contained. Table 3 affords a look at the raw instances of use reported by the 23 respondents and makes a graphic comment upon the texture of the total response. The response of Group A is seen to have been somewhat scant, but the response of the other two groups was reasonably well-dispersed throughout the categories.

TABLE 3

TOTAL INSTANCES OF RESPONSE IN THE CATEGORIES OF REFERENCE SOURCES LISTED IN QUESTIONNAIRE A WITH TOTAL INSTANCES OF VOLUNTEERED TITLES OFFERED BY GROUPS

Categories	Group A	Group B	Group C	Total
Abstracts	20	8	7	35
Bibliographies	1	8	6	15
Collections	1	13	7	21
Current Surveys	0	8	1	9
Directories	3	3	7	13
Encyclopedias & Dictionaries	8	7	13	28
Handbooks & Manuals	0	7	13	20
History & Illustration	0	0	14	14
Indexes	1	12	13	26
Statistics	2	11	3	16
Totals	36	77	84	197
Volunteered Titles	22	4	28	54
Combined Totals	58	81	112	251

From the table, the corrective force of the request for titles can be seen in the number of titles volunteered by each group. For Group A, they represented 61.11 per cent of their responses to the listed titles of the questionnaire, for Group B they represented 5.19 per cent of such titles, and for Group C they represented 33.33 per cent. (These percentages are without the greatest possible use factor.)

Summary. Response to Questionnaire A revealed in general moderate to rather light use of the titles it contained. The area titles received the heaviest response; the other-area titles, the least. The three groups varied in their response to reference-type categories and to the classes of area, general, and other titles. Group A, for whom the questionnaire offered a poorer choice of titles than for the other two groups, made heaviest use of abstracts and directories even with volunteered titles included, and showed only light use of handbooks and manuals and of indexes. Group B indicated greatest use in handbooks and manuals, and only lightly moderate use in current surveys, bibliographies and indexes. The members of this group used the encyclopedias and dictionaries and, surprisingly enough, the statistical sources, lightly. Group C used directories very heavily, handbooks and manuals and history and illustration moderately heavily, indexes moderately, and bibliographies lightly moderately. The request for titles from the three groups produced differences of response. Members of Group A were highly homogenous and were duplicative in many of the titles they volunteered. Members of Group B offered very few specific volunteered titles but said that they used many bibliographies, statistical sources, surveys, and directories pertinent to their work. Group C appeared to be the most humanistically oriented of the groups. They appeared to be more conversant with titles in other areas of speech and they showed an interesting combination of reference sources used in common and a highly individualistic list of volunteered titles. The needs of the three groups in relation to standard reference literature as indicated by their responses to Questionnaire A differ in kind and extent.

Analysis of Data Gathered from Questionnaire B, Part I

This section of this chapter attempts to analyze the data obtained from Part 1 of Questionnaire B in an effort to discover whether or not the sample population of faculty under study know of current reference and para-reference works and what the relationship between faculty knowledge and faculty use of such works is.

Questionnaire B, Part I. As was the case with Questionnaire A, the number of titles submitted to the faculty of each area of the department varied. The four forms of Part I contained from 7 titles for the phonetics specialist to 23 for the area of theater. Group A, the faculty of the area of speech pathology and audiology, were sent a form of 18 titles of which 4 were later adjudged not strictly suitable for one reason or another. Group B, the faculty of general speech, were sent a form of 19 titles of which 6 were subsequently deleted. Four titles were deleted from the 23 which were sent to the faculty of the area of theater. No titles were deleted from the list submitted to Group D, but, as a class of one, the set of responses for Part I of Questionnaire B were excluded from the study. Final computations for all groups were made with and without the deleted titles.

Nature of the Current Reference Titles Included in Questionnaire B. An effort was made to obtain a sweep of area interests and reference forms in the titles included in Part I of Questionnaire B. The emphasis varied from area to area to fit the nature of the work of the areas. For Group A, the area of speech pathology and audiology, the reference list included six collections (some of which were highly useful in a bibliographic way), four handbooks, two bibliographies, one directory, and one anatomy manual. Subjects included audiology, anatomy, aphasia, articulation, deafness, disfluency of speech, services for the deaf, stuttering, and time-compressed speech. Disqualified and deleted from the final current reference list were a source book on speech therapy, a directory of services for the handicapped, a bibliography on deafness, and one of two anatomy manuals.

The list of current reference sources for Group B, the area of general speech, included a directory, an index, a history, an abstract, a loose-leaf file providing encyclopedic information, a source book, a political dictionary, an encyclopedia, two collections, a conference report, and the multi-volume Nader project, encyclopedic in size, somewhat handbook in nature. Subjects included civil rights, statistics, oral interpretation, rhetoric, congressional information, congressional hearings and legislation, the latest data on world affairs, politics, biography, and black speakers and speeches. Disqualified were two specialized collections of rhetoric (one with an excellent bibliography), a handbook for reader's theater, a very recently shelved book with background information on the countries of the world, a very recently shelved dictionary of world history, and an anthology of recent rhetoric both written and spoken.

For Group C, the area of theater, the list of current reference sources included a catalog, a manual, two dictionaries, two encyclopedias, a handbook, a history, a group of indexes, four collections, a bibliography, three directories, a guide, and a checklist. Subjects covered were biography, black theater, contemporary drama, costume, criticism, drama, films, performing arts, reviews, scenery, theater (as opposed to drama), theater personnel, theater research, and world drama. Disqualified were two indexes to criticism, a handbook for scenery, and a book of theater essays.

The Categories of Response. Without knowing that these were current reference and para-reference works as defined for this study, the faculty of the four areas were asked to indicate in one of three spaces to the right of each reference title how well they knew each title. Their choices were to check Do Not Know or Know But Have Not Used (in which case a variety of reasons might prevail for their not having used the reference title) or to explain their needs in using it under the heading Have Used for Following Purposes.

Data returned from the three groups were tabulated and computed to find the percentages of Do Not Know, Know But Have Not Used, and Have Used for Following Purposes. In the process of the tabulation it became necessary to add the category of No Answer to accommodate a portion of four respondents' data. Two of these apparently simply forgot to check one title. One person failed to check five. One failed to check 12 and yet responded so fully in the Have Used for the Following Purposes category that the No Answer was almost certainly a Do Not Know. Yet to make the count quite clean, these responses were entered under No Answer. In order that the subsequent discussion of data might be simplified, in the following pages these four categories of response will often be referred to as unanswered, unknown, unused, and used.

Treatment of the Data. The data were treated both in terms of the percentage of books each individual respondent knew, arranged by group and in terms of how much use each individual book received. Computation for percentages in each category of response was made for the reference list with and without deleted titles. The two lists will hereafter be referred to as the inclusive and exclusive lists for purposes of simplification. For comparison with the data of Questionnaire A only the exclusive list will be used; for intra-Questionnaire B comparisons, the inclusive will be used when needed. Table 4 on the following page presents the percentage of response to the total list of current reference titles made by each respondent in each category of response.

Group A. The list of reference books submitted to Group A contained 18 titles. Of this list, four titles were subsequently deleted as being inappropriate to the list of current reference sources. The responses of the members of this group, expressed in percentages in Table 4, were heaviest in the unknown category. The percentages in the exclusive column of that category represent a total of 64 instances in which a book was unknown to the respondents. Four of those 9 replying, or 44 per cent, were unaware of over one-half of the books on the list. Three other respondents were unaware of 6 of the 13 or almost one-half of the titles. There were 40 responses in the unused category. Only one person checked more than one-half of the titles as known but unused. One other respondent checked 42.86 per cent or 6 titles. But over two-thirds of the group checked as known but unused 5 or fewer of the 14 titles. There were 24 indications of use in the used column for this group. One person had used as many as 50 per cent of the titles. A large majority of the group, 88.88 per cent, had used 4 or fewer of the 14 titles. Three of the nine respondents had used only one book.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSE IN CATEGORIES OF REPLY OF QUESTIONNAIRE B, PART 1 BY SINGLE RESPONDENTS OF GROUPS A, B, AND C

	Percentage of Response by Category							
	No Answer		Do Not Know		Have Not Used		Have Used	
Respondent	Incl.	Excl.	Incl.	Excl.	Incl.	Excl.	Incl.	Excl.
Group A								
1	0.00	0.00	38.89	42.86	44.44	42.86	16.67	14.29
3	0.00	0.00	38.89	42.86	22.22	28.57	38.89	28.57
4	5.56	7.14	66.67	78.57	11.11	7.14	16.67	7.14
5	0.00	0.00	11.11	14.29	27.78	35.71	61.11	50.00
6	5.56	7.14	16.67	14.29	55.56	57.14	22.22	21.43
7	0.00	0.00	33.33	42.86	38.89	35.71	27.78	21.43
8	0.00	0.00	44.44	50.00	38.89	35.71	16.67	14.29
9	0.00	0.00	55.56	57.14	38.89	35.71	5.56	7.14
10	0.00	0.00	83.33	85.71	11.11	7.14	5.56	7.14
Total A	1.23	1.59	43.21	47.62	32.10	31.75	23.46	19.05
Group B								
1	0.00	0.00	33.33	30.77	40.00	38.46	33.33	30.77
2	0.00	0.00	40.00	46.15	46.67	46.15	13.33	7.69
3	73.33	76.92	0.00	0.00	6.67	7.69	20.00	15.38
4	0.00	0.00	33.33	38.46	46.67	53.85	20.00	7.69
5	6.67	7.69	46.67	46.15	33.33	38.46	13.33	7.69
6	0.00	0.00	66.67	76.92	20.00	15.38	13.33	7.69
7	0.00	0.00	73.33	76.92	26.67	23.08	0.00	0.00
Total B	11.43	12.09	40.95	45.05	31.43	31.87	16.19	10.99
Group C								
1	0.00	0.00	36.36	42.11	31.82	26.32	31.82	31.58
2	4.54	5.26	54.55	57.89	31.82	26.32	9.09	10.53
3	22.73	26.32	9.09	10.53	22.73	21.05	45.45	42.11
4	0.00	0.00	54.55	57.89	31.82	31.58	13.64	10.53
6	0.00	0.00	22.73	26.32	36.36	31.58	40.91	42.11
7	0.00	0.00	81.82	84.21	4.55	5.26	13.64	10.53
8	0.00	0.00	45.45	47.37	50.00	47.37	4.55	5.26
Total C	3.90	4.51	43.51	46.62	29.87	27.07	22.73	21.80
Grand Total	4.75	5.43	42.76	46.57	31.12	30.00	21.38	18.00

The total group's percentage of *use* of the reference titles was 19.05 per cent; their *knowledge without use* of titles was 31.75 per cent; and their *unawareness* of titles was 43.21 per cent. When the 4 earlier-shelved titles which had been excluded were added to the list to study the effect which the group's responses to these titles had upon percentages, the percentage of *used* books increased by 4.41 points, the percentage of *unused* rose 0.35 points, and the percentage of *unknown* books decreased by 4.41 points. The number of responses in the *used* category moved from 24 to 38, a 58.33 per cent increase; the number of responses in the *unused* category moved from 40 to 52, a 30 per cent increase; and the number of responses in the *unknown* category moved from 64 to 70, a 9.38 per cent increase. It would appear that the introduction of the four earlier-shelved titles altered the frequency of response of *used* books on the list in an important way.

Group B. The list of reference books submitted to Group B contained 19 titles. Of this list, six titles were subsequently excluded as suspect for the purpose of this study. Response to the 13 remaining titles was heaviest in the *unknown* category which had a total of 41 responses. Two of the 7 respondents indicated that they were *unaware* of 10 of the 13 titles. Five respondents checked fewer than one-half of the titles as *unknown*. However, of these five, one who had no responses in the category failed to make any response to ten items. It was suspected that *unanswered* for this respondent meant *unknown*. If those responses had been so interpreted, the percentage of books *unknown* for this group would have been 56.04 per cent instead of the 45.04 per cent indicated on the table. There were 29 responses in the *unused* category. Only 1 respondent *knew but had not used* more than one-half of the 13 books. There were three respondents who *knew but had not used* from five to six of the books. Three other respondents *knew but had not used* three or fewer books on the list. In general, respondents tended to be aware of few of the 13 books which they did not use. There were ten responses in the *used* category. Of the respondents checking this category, none indicated the use of as many as one-third of the current reference books in this list. While the highest number of reference books *used* was four, there were four of the seven respondents who had used only one book.

The total group's percentage of *use* of the reference titles was 10.99 per cent; their *knowledge without use* was 31.87 per cent; and their *unawareness* of titles was 45.05 per cent. Four of the six titles which had been discarded were not suitable for returning to the list for testing their effect upon use because they were not originally excluded for being well known. When the 2 established titles were returned to the list, however, the group percentage of *used* titles increased 5.20 points, their knowledge *without use* increased a slight, almost unchanged 0.44 points, and their response in the *unknown* category increased 4.10 points. Returning these books to the list increased the number of responses in the used category by the 7 respondents from 10 to 17, a 70 per cent increase; the number of responses in the unused category from 29 to 33, a 13.79 per cent increase; and the number of responses in the unknown category from 41 to 44, a 7.32 per cent increase. As in the responses in Group A, the addition of previously excluded, earlier-shelved titles increased the responses in the used category to a greater degree than those in the categories of unused or unknown. Group B's increase in percentage of titles used when the excluded books were returned to the list was greater than that of Group A.

Group C. The list of reference works submitted to Group C contained 23 titles. Of these, four titles were subsequently excluded as unsuited to the purpose of this study. Response to the remaining 19 titles was heaviest in the unknown category in which 62 responses were made. In this category, 3 of the 7 respondents indicated that they were unaware of 11 or more of the 19 titles, or of more than one-half of the total list; 1 of these was unaware of 16 of the 19 titles. Two other respondents were unaware of nine titles, or almost one-half of the list. Only two people were unaware of five or fewer titles; one of these reported not knowing only two. This same respondent, however, made five of the six responses in the unanswered category. There were 36 responses in the unused category. One respondent checked nine unused titles. Six of the seven members of this group knew but did not use less than one-third of the titles on the list. One respondent checked only one unused title. There were 29 responses in the *used* category. Here, 2 of the 7 respondents had *used* as many as 8 of the 19 titles or 42.11 per cent of the list; 1 had *used* 6 titles or 31.58 per cent of the list. The other four respondents in the group had *used* no more than two titles.

The group percentage of Group C's *use* of this *exclusive* list of reference titles was 21.80 per cent; their knowledge of the titles *without use* was 27.07 per cent; and their *unawareness* of titles was 46.62 per cent. When the responses to 3 of the 4 excluded titles were returned to the list to study the effect of their inclusion, the percentage of *used* titles for the group increased to 22.73 per cent, their percentage of *known but unused* titles increased to 29.87 per cent, and their percentage of *unknown* titles decreased to 43.51 per cent. The number of responses in the *used* category increased from 29 to 35, the number in the *known but unused* category increased from 36 to 46, and the number in the *unknown* category increased from 62 to 67. In the case of Group C, adding the responses to the previously excluded, earlier-shelved titles did not increase the responses in the *used* category to a degree equal to that increase in the *unused*, and the *used* responses were only slightly larger than the responses in the *unknown* category.

Comparison and Aggregate of Response of Groups A, B, and C. A comparison of the total group percentages of Groups A, B, and C in each category of the *exclusive* lists (Table 4) reveal surprisingly similar patterns despite differences in subject matter, numbers of reference titles submitted to the groups, and numbers of respondents in each group. The group percentages for the used category are 19.05 per cent for Group A, 10.99 per cent for Group B, and 21.80 per cent for Group C. For the unused category the percentage was 31.75 per cent for Group A, 31.87 per cent for Group B, and 27.07 per cent for Group C. For the unknown category the percentage for Group A was 47.62 per cent, for Group B it was 45.05 per cent; and for Group C 46.62 per cent. In the unanswered category, Group A had 1.59 per cent response; Group B had 12.09 per cent (10.98 per cent of which came from one person), and Group C had 4.51 per cent. Despite one or two dissimilar percentages cited above, the groups' responses to this inquiry into the extent of their knowledge and use of current reference books were more alike than unlike.

The return of books whose first shelving date was earlier than 1970, sometimes by several years, produced interesting, although not conclusive, results. As can be seen from a study of the inclusive lists in the table, the percentage of use for all three groups rose when such books were returned. The amount of increase of used books was 4.41 percentage points for Group A, 5.20 points for Group B, and 0.93 points for Group C. When this increase is compared to what happened in the unused category with the return of those older titles to the list the increase of used books may gain in importance. The amount of difference in the checks in the unused category were an 0.35 percentage-point drop for

Group A, a drop of 0.44 points for Group B, and 2.30 points for Group C. The difference in percentage points of books checked as unknown was 4.41 points for Group A, 2.94 points for Group B, and 3.11 points for Group C. The percentages of the three groups are not sharply different. What seems to have occurred for all three groups is an increase in used titles with a corresponding loss in the percentage of unknown titles. The number of books returned were far too few to establish any trend as certain.

The comparatively low percentage of used titles of the exclusive list by Group B (10.99 per cent to Group A's 19.05 per cent and Group C's 21.80 per cent) perhaps suggests something about the nature of the current reference literature of that field. Perhaps it simply notes what is patent: There are more reference works which cover the social, economic, military, and political affairs of men than there are current reference sources for the narrower areas of theater or speech pathology and audiology. Alternative current references may be the personal preferences of the members of the group and may account for their lower percentage of use of current reference titles on this list.

The groups when placed together rather than compared used 18 per cent of the reference titles, knew but did not use 30 per cent of them, and did not know 46.57 per cent. Of the 350 responses possible by all of the respondents in the department, 19 of them, or 5.43 per cent, were omitted.

Usage of Titles by Book. In the preceding pages of this discussion, the question of faculty knowledge and use of current reference books has been approached from the point of view of the respondents and how many of the titles they reacted to and in what ways. But it is also possible to discuss the degree of use individual books received, what the pattern of use was by book, what books received heavy use, and what, if any, relationship appeared between use and shelving date.

Tables 5, 6, and 7 present the list of books submitted to Groups A, B, and C, respectively, and the percentage of faculty use each book received in all the categories heretofore discussed. The column labeled *Shelving Date* notes the year in which the reference book was first placed on the shelf and made available to the university library patron. This date has a bearing on this discussion, for it indicates how much time the respondents of this study had to become acquainted with the reference books on the list before they received the set of questionnaires inquiring into their use of those books.

Reference List of Group A. Table 5 presents the list of current reference books submitted to Group A in Questionnaire B, Part I. The last column in the table, *Percentage Who Knew and Used*, reveals the degree of use any one book received and the comparative use of all the books. Books on this Group A list did not as a rule receive heavy use. Only 1 book was used by 7 of the 9 members of the group, and 14 of the 18 books on the list were used by 3 or fewer

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF SEPARATE REFERENCE BOOKS LISTED IN QUESTIONNAIRE B BY GROUP A

Shelving Date	Book Identification	Percentage Who Gave No Answer	Percentage Who Did Not Know	Percentage Who Knew Without Use	Percentage Who Knew And Used
*73	Black	0.00	22.22	44.44	33.33
72	Byrd	0.00	77.78	22.22	0.00
74	Carterette	11.11	66.67	22.22	0.00
74	Council	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33
72	Dickson	11.11	66.67	11.11	11.11
*71	Directory	0.00	11.11	11.11	77.78
74	Duker	0.00	88.89	11.11	0.00
72	Emerick	0.00	33.33	33.33	33.33
*74	Fellendorf	0.00	44.44	33.33	22.22
74	Goodglass	0.00	22.22	44.44	33.33
74	International	0.00	55.56	33.33	11.11
73	Katz	0.00	11.11	55.56	33.33
73	Moses	0.00	55.56	44.44	0.00
*72	Palmer	0.00	33.33	44.44	22.22
74	Reagan	0.00	66.67	33.33	0.00
73	Sarno	0.00	22.22	33.33	44.44
70	Sheehan	0.00	11.11	33.33	55.56
74	Wolfe	0.00	55.56	33.33	11.11

*A title preceded by an asterisk is one which was discovered in the process of uncovering the shelving date to have been published earlier in some form by a different corporate author, by a different author, under a different title, or to have been shelved so recently that despite publication date the title had had no chance for proper exposure, or to be otherwise inappropriate. Subsequent computations in the study were made with and without those titles among this number that had been published earlier, but the results with their exclusion are those compared to data from Questionnaire A.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF SEPARATE REFERENCE BOOKS LISTED IN QUESTIONNAIRE B BY GROUP B

Shelving Date	Book Identification	Percentage Who Gave No Answer	Percentage Who Did Not Know	Percentage Who Knew Without Use	Percentage Who Knew And Used
73	Adams	14.29	85.71	0.00	0.00
74	American	28.57	28.57	28.57	14.29
74	Bahn	14.29	14.29	42.86	28.57
*74	Barrett	0.00	57.14	28.57	14.29
*73	Brandes	0.00	0.00	42.86	57.14
73	Chicorel	14.29	71.43	14.29	0.00
*74	Coger	14.29	28.57	28.57	28.57
73	Congressional	14.29	28.57	42.86	14.29
*75	Countries	14.29	85.71	0.00	0.00
70	Deadline	14.29	71.43	14.29	0.00
*75	Dictionary	0.00	42.86	42.86	14.29
73	Ehninger	0.00	14.29	42.86	42.86
74	Laqueur	14.29	57.14	14.29	14.29
73	McGraw-Hill	14.29	28.57	57.14	0.00
73	Nelson	14.29	85.71	0.00	0.00
72	O'Neill	0.00	71.43	28.57	0.00
72	The Prospect	0.00	28.57	57.14	14.29
74	Ralph Nader	14.29	0.00	71.43	14.29
*73	Stewart	0.00	0.00	28.57	71.43

*A title preceded by an asterisk is one which presented difficulties. See Table 5 for a full explanation. Barrett's and Brandes' books, as well as *Countries of the World* and *Dictionary of World History* in this table were completely eliminated from further consideration.

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF SEPARATE REFERENCE BOOKS LISTED IN QUESTIONNAIRE B BY GROUP C

Shelving Date	Book Identification	Percentage Who Gave No Answer	Percentage Who Did Not Know	Percentage Who Knew Without Use	Percentage Who Knew And Used
72	American	14.29	71.43	14.29	0.00
73	Arnold	0.00	57.14	28.57	14.29
73	Brockett	14.29	28.57	14.29	42.86
74	Bryson	14.29	42.86	14.29	28.57
*72	Burris-Meyer	0.00	14.29	14.29	71.43
73	Chicorel	0.00	57.14	28.57	14.29
*74	Clurman	0.00	71.43	14.29	14.29
73	Contemporary	0.00	85.71	0.00	14.29
72	Crowell's	0.00	57.14	28.57	14.29
71	Hatch	0.00	42.86	57.14	0.00
74	Highfill	14.29	71.43	14.29	0.00
73	International	0.00	28.57	57.14	14.29
70	Kirby	14.29	57.14	14.29	14.29
72	Lowe	0.00	28.57	28.57	42.86
71	McCarty	14.29	85.71	0.00	0.00
73	McGraw-Hill	0.00	28.57	14.29	57.14
73	Matlaw	0.00	42.86	14.29	42.86
74	The National	0.00	42.86	42.86	14.29
72	The N.Y. Times	0.00	0.00	14.29	85.71
*70	Palmer	0.00	42.86	57.14	0.00
*73	Salem	0.00	14.29	71.43	14.29
74	The Theatre	0.00	42.86	42.86	14.29
74	Who's Who	0.00	14.29	85.71	0.00

*A title preceded by an asterisk is one which presented difficulties. See Table 5 for a full explanation. The Clurman title in this table was completely eliminated from further consideration.

faculty members. Two books received fairly heavy use: (1) the *_Directory of Services for the Handicapped in Indiana_, and (2) Joseph Green Sheehan's _Stuttering: Research and Therapy_.

If the percentages of the _used_ and _known but unused_ columns of Table 5 are combined, every one of the older titles which were excluded from the _exclusive_ list had a combined percentage of about 50 per cent. Six of the books listed in Table 5 would appear to be central to the work of the department because the combined percentages of these columns indicate that as many as seven or eight of the nine faculty respondents of the area knew them with or without use. Martha Black's *_School Speech Therapy: A Source Book_, the *_Directory of Services for the Handicapped in Indiana_, Harold Goodglass' _Psycholinguistics and Aphasia_, Jack Katz' _Handbook of Clinical Audiology_, Martha Taylor Sarno's _Aphasia: Selected Readings_, and Joseph Green Sheehan's _Stuttering: Research and Therapy_ have high combined percentages. Their shelving dates divide them evenly into periods _before 1973_ and _1973 and after_, but only one was shelved as late as 1974.

Four of the books on the list were not known by at least six of the nine respondents in this group: Sam Duker's _Time-Compressed Speech: An Anthology and Bibliography_, Oliver E. and Thomas R. Byrd's _Medical Readings on Vision, Speech, and Hearing_, Edward C. Carterette and M. P. Friedman's _Handbook of Perception_, Vol. III, _Biology of_

Perceptual Systems, and Cora Lee Reagan's Handbook of Auditory Perceptual Training. All of these books except one have a 1974 shelving date; the book by Oliver and Thomas Byrd was shelved in 1973.

The question arises: Was the shelving date a factor in the use of both of these groups of books? Unfortunately, there were not enough current titles used in this study to do much more than to make observation of the extent to which the respondents knew them and/or used them. But for Group A, recency of shelving did seem to be a factor in their use of this particular list of current reference and para-reference books.

Group B. Table 6 presents the list of reference books submitted to Group B, Part I. The 18 books in this list received a very light pattern of use. Two of the books were used by over half the group: *Charles J. Stewart's On Speech Communication: An Anthology of Contemporary Writings and *Paul Dickerson Brandes' The Rhetoric of Revolt. But eight of the books were used by only one person and six received no use at all.

Five books were well-known if the percentages of the unused (but known) and the used categories are combined: *Brandes' Rhetoric of Revolt, Douglas Ehninger's Contemporary Rhetoric: A Reader Coursebook, McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Biography, the Ralph Nader Congress Project's Citizens' Look at Congress and Statistical Supplement to Congressional Profiles, and Charles J.

Stewart's *On Speech Communication: An Anthology of Contemporary Writings and Messages*. As indicated by Table 6, the shelving dates of these titles were 1973 and after. Only one, however, has a shelving date as late as 1974.

A. John Adams and Joan Martin Burke's *Civil Rights: A Current Guide to the People, Organizations, and Events*, Marietta Chicorel's *Indexes to Poetry*. . . . **Countries of the World, Deadline Data on World Affairs*, Alice Ruth (Moore) Dunbar Nelson's *Masterpieces of Negro Eloquence* (a reprint of a 1920 collection not available until 1972), and Daniel Joseph O'Neill's *Speeches by Black Americans* all were unknown by most of the respondents in Group A. Of these six, four have shelving dates of 1973 or after; two have shelving dates before 1973.

For this group, recency of shelving through 1973 did not seem to affect use adversely.

Reference List of Group C. Table 7 presents the list of reference books submitted to Group C in Questionnaire B, Part I. In general, the 23 books contained in the list received light use. The exceptions to this generalization were the *New York Times Theater Reviews, 1920-1970* and Harold Burris-Meyer and Edward C. Cole's *Scenery for the Theatre: The Organization, Processes, Materials, and Techniques Used to Set the Stage*, which were used by five out of seven and six out of seven respondents respectively. Sixteen of the 23 books, however, were used by 1 person or none at all.

There were five books which received high percentages when the categories of *unused* (but known) and *used* were combined: *Burris-Meyer and Cole's *Scenery for the Theatre* (although it might be suspected that the respondents were aware of the 1946 edition instead of the new one), Claudia Jean Lowe's *A Guide to Reference and Bibliography for Theatre* Research, the McGraw-Hill *Encyclopedia of World Drama*, *The New York Times Theater Reviews, 1920-1970*, and *James M. Salem's *A Guide to Critical Reviews*. All of these except the McGraw-Hill *Encyclopedia of World Drama* have shelving dates before 1973 and the two titles with asterisks were first published before 1970.

There were six books which received high percentages in the *unknown* category: The *American Film Institute Catalog of Motion Pictures Produced in the United States*, Phillip Highfill, Jr., K. Barnim, and Edward Langhaus' *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*, Oscar Brockett and R. Findley's *Century of Innovation: A History of European and American Theatre and Drama Since 1870*, *Harold Clurman's *The Divine Pastime: Theatre Essays*, the Gale-published *Contemporary Literary Criticism*, and Clifford McCarty's *Published Screenplays: A Checklist*. Four of these titles were shelved in 1973 or after. The *American Film Institute Catalog* and McCarty's *Checklist* were shelved in 1972 and 1971 respectively, but it may be argued that their subject matter is of sufficient distance from the central concerns of the area that degree of recency becomes secondary to degree of pertinency.

In general, the books which the respondents of Group C knew best were those shelved before 1973 and those which they knew least were those shelved in 1973 or after.

This discussion of the use which individual books received has attempted to establish an observable correlation between the dates of shelving and the respondents' knowledge and/or use of the books submitted to them in this study. The titles with asterisks have been included in this particular examination of titles, and the generally heavy use afforded those excluded because of shelving dates earlier than 1970 tend to suggest that use of a book comes with prolonged knowledge of it. Moreover, of the 19 books with a 1974 shelving date and 2 shelved in 1975, only 4 were used by more than 1 person and none by more than 3 of 9 or 2 of 7 of the respondents. Five were not used. In the study of these books it is, of course, impossible to deny the effect of other variables as well. But in the titles given above, it is generally to be noted that books with early shelving dates are associated with higher percentages of the respondents' knowledge and use of them while books with late shelving dates are associated with higher percentages of respondents' unawareness of them.

Comparison of Group Reactions to Titles Shelved in Three Time Periods. Table 8 arranges both the inclusive lists of books presented to each of the three groups of respondents and the exclusive lists in three time bands:

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF CURRENT REFERENCE BOOKS BY GROUPS A, B, AND C AND BY THE DEPARTMENT ARRANGED BY CHRONOLOGICAL SUB-PERIODS WITHIN THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD

Group, List, and Period	Percentage Who Gave No Answer	Percentage Who Did Not Know	Percentage Who Knew Without Use	Percentage Who Knew And Used
Group A				
Inclusive List				
Before and 71	0.00	24.44	33.33	42.22
72 and 73	1.85	44.44	33.33	20.37
74-	1.59	55.56	30.16	12.70
Exclusive List				
Before and 71	0.00	11.11	33.33	55.56
72 and 73	1.85	44.44	33.33	20.37
74-	1.59	55.56	30.16	12.70
Group B				
Inclusive List				
Before and 71	9.52	33.33	23.81	33.33
72 and 73	8.93	51.79	30.36	8.93
74-	17.86	25.00	39.29	17.86
Exclusive List				
Before and 71	14.29	71.43	14.29	0.00
72 and 73	8.93	51.79	30.36	8.93
74-	17.86	25.00	39.29	17.86
Group C				
Inclusive List				
Before and 71	4.76	42.86	35.71	16.67
72 and 73	2.60	44.16	22.08	31.17
74-	5.71	42.86	40.00	11.43
Exclusive List				
Before and 71	9.52	61.90	23.81	4.76
72 and 73	2.60	44.16	22.08	31.17
74-	5.71	42.86	40.00	11.43
All Groups				
Inclusive List				
Before and 71	3.70	33.33	32.41	30.56
72 and 73	4.28	46.52	27.81	21.39
74-	6.35	45.24	34.92	13.49
Exclusive List				
Before and 71	8.11	51.35	24.32	16.22
72 and 73	4.28	46.52	27.81	21.39
74-	6.35	45.24	34.92	13.49

(1) before and throughout 1971, (2) 1972 and 1973, and (3) 1974- . In this division, the time periods have been altered from those of the discussion above in order to observe differences among group knowledge-use reactions to the list of reference books. Using the same response categories which have been utilized throughout the study, the table presents composite percentages of knowledge-use reactions to all books in each of the time bands for each category. Arrangement has been by groups and by combined groups or total department.

When the small number of books in each of the lists submitted to the various areas of the department are further divided by time bands, the number of books which serve as a basis of this discussion is so small that the patterns produced by such division must be considered suggestive only. Moreover, the current reference books were selected for this study by criteria that did not include balance by year within the five-year period. Therefore, the factor of selection may make appearances deceptive.

(1) Comparison of the Ranges of Group Reaction to Titles Shelved in Three Time Periods. One observable difference in the percentages of use by the three groups was that of range. In the category of books known and used, there was a wider range of percentages of use among the three time bands of the exclusive lists of Groups A and B than among those of their inclusive lists. Group A had a range of 42.86 percentage points for the exclusive list and 29.52

percentage points for the inclusive list; Group C had a range of 26.41 percentage points for the exclusive list and 19.74 percentage points for the inclusive list. Group B, on the other hand, had a range of 24.40 percentage points for the inclusive list and 17.86 percentage points for the exclusive list. The department ranges for the two lists were 17.07 percentage points for the inclusive list and 7.90 percentage points for the exclusive lists. The difference between the ranges of the two lists for each group was 13.34 points for Group A, 6.54 points for Group B, 6.67 points for Group C, and 9.17 points with the 3 groups combined as the department. Why the groups ranged in these directions or to these extents is not clear. The influencing factor may have been the choice of titles, the mix of shelving dates on the lists, numbers in the groups, or some unknown factor. If it was not any of these, perhaps the best guess that can be made is that the differences may reflect different reference needs of the different groups in regard to recency of material.

(2) Comparison of the Patterns of Progression and Regression of Percentages of Use. The patterns of use created by the group percentages of books used varied for all three groups. Group A's use of reference books diminished as the recency of the shelving date increased (55.56 to 20.37 to 12.70 per cent). Group B's use of current reference books increased as the recency of the shelving date increased (0.00 to 8.93 to 17.86 per cent). Group C's use of reference books increased from 1971 to 1972-1973 and then decreased

rather sharply in 1974 (4.76 to 31.17 to 11.43 per cent).

(3) Comparison of the Percentages of Used Reference Titles of the Three Groups for the 1974 Time Band. The percentage of used reference titles for the separate groups was relatively similar for the 1974 shelving-date period. As shown in Table 8, the percentage of use of titles on the exclusive list for this period for Group A was 12.70 per cent, for Group B it was 17.86 per cent, and for Group C it was 11.43 per cent. Regardless of how large the percentage was in the earlier time bands or how erratically it progressed through those years, for those works shelved in 1974 the use by all three groups is proportionally similar and very light.

Prediction of the Additional Number of Books Which Would be Expected to be Used by the Respondents of the Three Groups If They Were Known. From the number of books unknown, the number of books known but unused and the number known and used of the titles on the exclusive list of Questionnaire B, it is possible to compute the number of books the groups of respondents might have been expected to use if they had been made aware of them. Table 9 summarizes those computations. Group A knew 64 books in all and knew and used 24. The percentage of known and used to known was 34.50 per cent. At that rate, if this group of respondents had been made aware of the 60 books they did not know, collectively they might have been expected to use 23.3 more books. The respondents in Group B might have been expected as a group to use 7.60 additional books. Those in Group C would have been likely to use 26.01 more books. The total number of books likely to have been used of the 163 not known by all three groups is 56.91 books. This means that each respondent would have been likely to have used 2.47 more reference titles had he known of them. Actually, since individual respondents had individual ratios of unused but known to used, some would have been expected to use more and some fewer than this number. But for Groups A and C this added awareness would have meant, if the expectancy rate prevailed, that as groups their members would have used almost twice as many current reference works as they did and for Group C the use would have been slightly less than twice as many.

TABLE 9

COMPUTATION BY GROUP OF ADDITIONAL BOOKS RESPONDENTS WOULD HAVE BEEN LIKELY TO USE IF THEY HAD KNOWN OF THEM

Group	Number of Books Known	Number of Books Known and Used	Percentage of Books Used of Those Known	Number of Books Not Known	Additional Books Likely To Be Known
A	64	24	37.50	60	23.30*
B	39	10	25.64	41	7.60*
C	65	29	44.62	62	26.01*
Total	168	63	37.50	163	56.91*

*Obtained from individual rather than group data. The figures differ somewhat from those to be obtained by applying the group percentages and in grand total are more conservative.

Comparison of the Essential Data from Questionnaires A and B (Part I)

The data received from the respondents of Group A (the faculty of the area of speech pathology and audiology), Group B (the faculty of the area of general speech), and Group C (the faculty of the area of theater) through Questionnaires A and B, Part I, have been subjected to analysis in the preceding pages. They have been studied with a view toward discerning their patterns and relationships. The purpose of this study now requires a comparison of the percentages of faculty use of the reference titles submitted to them in Questionnaires A and B, Part I.

Table 10 presents the percentage of _area_ reference titles indicated as used by respondents on the two questionnaires. The titles from Questionnaire A were restricted to area titles only so that they would compare to the titles (which were _all_ area titles) submitted to the sample population in Questionnaire B, Part I. The titles from Questionnaire B, Part I, were those of the _exclusive_ list of titles so that they would represent only those reference titles shelved after January 1, 1970, and would thus contrast with the earlier, better-established area titles taken from Questionnaire A. The figures in the third column of the table are the points of difference in the percentages of _used_ books of the list of older reference titles and those of the list of current reference titles explained above.

For Group A the percentage of _used_ area titles from Questionnaire A was 33.33 per cent and from Questionnaire B it was 19.05 per cent for a percentage difference of 14.28 points. For Group B the percentage of _used_ area titles from

TABLE 10

EXTENT OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCENTAGES OF USE OF THE AREA BOOKS OF QUESTIONNAIRE A AND THOSE OF QUESTIONNAIRE B BY GROUPS A, B, AND C, SEPARATELY AND COMBINED

Groups	Questionnaire A Used Area Reference Books	Questionnaire B Used Current Reference Books	Difference In Percentages
Group A	33.33	19.05	14.28
Group B	31.87	10.99	20.88
Group C	46.43	21.80	24.63
Total Group	36.87	18.00	18.87

Questionnaire A was 31.87 per cent and from Questionnaire B it was 10.99, for a percentage difference of 20.88 points. For Group C the percentage of used area titles was 46.43 per cent and from Questionnaire B it was 21.80 for a percentage difference of 24.63 points. For the total group combined, the percentage of used area titles from Questionnaire A was 36.87 and from Questionnaire B it was 18.00 for a difference of 18.87 percentage points. The differences for all these groups are statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence as verified by the application of the "t" test.

The preceding pages of this chapter deal with the reactions of the sample population of this study to lists of reference titles submitted to them in Questionnaire A and Questionnaire B, Part I. They were also sent, as Part II of Questionnaire B (see Appendix), an inquiry into their reaction to the first list submitted and into their current reference needs and attitudes. The analysis of that portion of their reply follows.

Analysis of Data Gathered from Questionnaire B, Part II

As described in Chapter III, Part II of Questionnaire B consisted of nine questions occupying two pages and requiring a Yes/No check answer or a check of multiple choices. Each question also provided a space for written explanation and the respondents were specifically urged to make such for five of the nine questions. These questions and the replies received for them will be discussed one by one.

Question 1: Do you feel that the work of your field requires substantial support from reference materials? There were 19 affirmative answers, and 4 negative ones. Group A checked eight Yeses and one No, Group B checked six Yeses and one No. Group C checked five Yeses and two Noes. There were 16 written replies. Those supportive of the affirmative answers ranged from the brief but emphatic type such as "I need it" and "very much" to the longer explanatory type. One said, "In the past decade the amount of published material has expanded so prolifically I'm dependent on abstracts and up-dated bibliographies." Another respondent in the same area replied, "Much research. Our field changes. Draws from many areas. Linguistics is the latest." A third added, "New developments [are] usually in periodicals first. [I] need reference to make use of periodicals practical and efficient." Two similar comments strengthened this response. Another respondent in the same area spoke of research needs: He felt that it was necessary to have support from reference materials "particularly to eliminate duplication of effort in research and to consolidate broad areas of knowledge into workable form." General speech mentioned need for reference materials in teaching the fundamental course of public speaking, as well as oratory, and persuasion. Theater personnel stressed need for reference regarding "new materials, systems, studies in management and design." Duplicate mention of the need to do research for productions of the department occurred.

A very large majority felt that the work of their areas required wide and substantial support from reference materials.

Question 2: *Do you have access to recent reference materials relevant to your work through some other source than the library*? A variety of answers to check were afforded and the respondents generously complied: 5 checked *teaching area*, 22 checked *personal library*, 1 checked *some other source* without being explicit, and 1 checked *no other source*. Answers supplied in comment were "publishers' ad sheets," "letters to various government agencies," "[letters to] interest groups," "local libraries," "interlibrary loan" (mentioned twice), "book publishers," and "dissertation copies."

The answers suggested a diversity of sources which were incremented by volunteered commencs in Questionnaire A by a member of the speech and hearing area that he relied on a "computerized bibliography on Speech Pathology distributed through Johns Hopkins University and listed as *Current Citations*."

This diversity of available sources of reference works may speak to emerging patterns of faculty reference and research. Lawson, who made a study of reference services at Emory University and the University of Florida, expressed some surprise at the total faculty reference use at those institutions being only 9 per cent and 7 per cent respectively.[21] This is really not so surprising when the proportion of faculty to students is considered, even without the earlier faculty attitude of self-sufficiency in research described by Rothstein in his history of research service in university libraries[22] and perpetuated, in myth at least, to the present day. But the number of extra-library sources through which information is available, the many forms in which the growth of technology now permits it to be disseminated, and the degree to which communication about the availability of such information has been perfected combine to explain some faculty disuse of university library resources--as sources listed in response to this and its companion questionnaire indicate.

Question 3: Are such reference materials as are obtained from these extra-library sources adequate for your needs? Eleven respondents (four from Group A, five from Group B, one from Group C, and one from Group D) gave an affirmative answer. Twelve (five from Group A, two from Group B, and five from Group C) replied negatively. The written replies in general supported the affirmative view: "(Probable? Not) [sic] I think they are." Or, "Generally narrow professional orientation to specialty which does not require crossing into many specialties." Or (giving reason for their use), "More up-to-date. Major advantage is having our own copy." And, the laconic "For their purpose." There were comments from Group C on this question in keeping with their expressed dependency upon library sources.

Question 4: Do you feel well-acquainted with the reference materials in your specific field which the library has acquired within the last five years? Eleven respondents (four from Group A, five from Group B, and two from Group C) felt well-acquainted with the reference materials. Thirteen (four from Group A, two from Group B, five from Group C, and one from Group D) did not. The respondents pleaded "insufficient time," admitted "neglect," felt insufficiently "free to 'explore,'" felt that their class assignment did not require acquaintanceship with reference materials, spoke of "torpidity," said they were "not always aware of new acquisitions," asserted that their most helpful materials were in professional journals, felt that the lists of reference materials on bibliographic lists, etc. were familiar to them, noted that the department made up library orders and informed faculty as to what had been ordered, believed that their experience in developing and updating reading lists kept them abreast of the new material, and two observed that they had just come back into the field or into the state. Two respondents made it a point to "stay up to date," one of them volunteering that he "made it a point to browse and chat with the reference librarian once or twice a year."

The most frequent reason given for lack of acquaintance with current reference books was lack of time. Many replies were apologetic and regretful. Most important to this study is the fact that unawareness of current acquisitions was specifically mentioned twice.

Question 5: Did you elect to receive the list of recent additions of books catalogued which is periodically prepared and sent to interested faculty by this university library? Fourteen respondents (four from Group A, four from Group B, five from Group C, and one from Group D) checked Yes for this question, eight (three from Group A, three from Group B, and two from Group C) checked No. There were two from Group A who failed to reply.

Two people gave a negative added comment, one of which was only partially so:

> 1. Usually irrelevant--very few items of interest of application to my interest area.
>
> 2. Area gives list of books ordered. Not really aware of the list. Unless specific to area of specialization, would be too unwieldy.

One gave a pragmatic answer:

> 3. I was making no use of the notification, and because I saw no need to burden the library staff and increase university expenditure for one who did not use the list.

Four appeared to be puzzled by the existence of the list:

> 4. Have never seen or been notified about list.
>
> 5. Do not recall receiving information re same.
>
> 6. I missed out somewhere--probably sent it in late.
>
> 7. I was never made aware of the availability of this list, but I would be interested in this list.

The remaining responses ranged from wistful to eager expressions of appreciation of the value of the list:

8. To keep updated, but I haven't been receiving the list the last couple of years.

9. But I don't always receive it.

10. Have in the past, but don't recall being offered this service for the past two years.

11. I think so, but haven't seen a list lately so may not have done so.

12. Provides sometimes initial awareness of books I may be interested in.

13. I was on the mailing list for several years and found it to be most helpful in alerting me to new acquisitions. Somehow my name apparently came off the list and I have neglected to get back on. I would be most grateful if the library would resume sending the list to me.

14. [I] Need for Speech 320, 521, 522, 501.

The tone of these comments in general quarrels with the notion that the librarian and the professor are inimical to one another. The greater number of the respondents' remarks indicate their desire for a closer tie to current materials coming into the library.

Question 6: Would an annotated list of recently acquired reference titles specifically directed to your area of scholarship be of value to you in preparing bibliographies, etc.? There were 23 respondents who answered Yes; 1 in Group B answered No.

This question received the most Yes answers of any of the questions on the questionnaire. There were 14 written comments with only 3 of them tepid in tone:

1. Could be.

2. As a clinical supervisor, I do not spend much time preparing bibliographies. By the time I get the students they have received this kind of information through their classwork.

3. But, I fail to see why this library would offer this large expenditure of time and staffing, as it has not previously met several of my reference requests.

The majority showed more enthusiasm:

4. Especially if I took the time to check them out.

5. I use my own copies of DSH Abstracts and the monthly Rehabilitation Literature as resources information; however, I realize it is not as comprehensive as I might wish.

6. Very much.

7. I need it.

8. Would be helpful and time-saving.

9. Would save invaluable time for individual, but would undoubtedly involve too much time for library personnel to prepare such material for us.

10. Annotated generally preferable to title listing. Specifically would conserve time in using the bibliographies. Might offer savings in producing such lists when only interest area is consulted.

11. Tho' I believe departments should at least share the cost of this service and that the service should work closely as a joint responsibility with the faculty initiating the request.

12. Definitely. I'd post it or bind it with Film Service Catalog and other vitals.

13. Beautiful idea!

Four respondents indicated that it would be a time-saving factor. The comments made to the question of the desirability of receiving annotative bibliographies of area acquisitions tended to be reflective, evaluative, and aware of the cost of their production to all concerned.

Question 7: What do you perceive the reference librarian's contribution to your work to be? There was an opportunity to check more than one answer and the respondents did so. There were 19 respondents (6 from Group A, 5 from Group B, 7 from Group C, and 1 from Group D) who checked *locating specific information as the need arises* and 22 respondents (8 from Group A, 7 from Group B, 6 from Group C, and 1 from Group D) who checked *informing of the existence and specific nature of new reference publications which apply* to your field. There were two respondents who added *assistance to students* as a function, and one who included *special reference services*. Two of the respondents went to the trouble of changing the order of *locating* and *informing* so that *informing* had priority even though these respondents checked both functions. One respondent specifically emphasized the equal importance of both.

Nearly all respondents felt that both functions of the reference librarian were important. The seven comments which were added were largely those that underlined the faculty member's dependency on the librarian or his expectation of expertise from him. The fullest answer was representative of the composite group feeling:

> [The reference librarian] should be able to give information regarding specific problems I encounter or [to explain] how things are organized regarding where reference and specific services are kept and rationale, when and if I have problems.

The responses given to the question above, and particularly the response immediately above, suggest that the faculty of this study places expertise in materials before simple directive assistance.

Question 8: Ignoring the books included in the first questionnaire which lie outside your area of teaching, how would you rate the relevance of those on that list which do apply to your field? The question was designed as a check on the validity of Questionnaire A as an instrument to measure use of standard titles. In order that their judgment might be made with total recall, both in the case of this question and the following one, a copy of the first questionnaire was returned to each faculty member cooperating in the study with his copy of the second questionnaire.

There were 8 respondents who found the list highly relevant, 12 who found it moderately so, and 3 who found it barely relevant. Of the respondents in Group A, who had 11 total pertinent items to check in their area, 4 rated its relevance high, 4 rated it moderate, and 1 said that it was barely relevant. The respondents in Group B, who had the most area titles, a list of 26, rated it somewhat lower: 1 found it highly relevant, 5 found it moderately relevant, and 1 barely so. Of those respondents in Group C, who had 16 specific reference titles on the first questionnaire, 3 said that the list was highly relevant, 3 moderately relevant, and 1 failed to check any answer. The respondent in Group D found it barely relevant (and this evaluation accurately assesses the number of titles in his specific area).

This was an important question to the study. The respondents did not know when they answered Questionnaire A that the method of the investigation was to measure their use of older, more established, or standard works against their use of current reference titles pertaining to their area. Nor did they know when they answered Questionnaire B what the thrust of the study was. What they appear to have said here is that many of the titles submitted were a fair test of standard reference needs in these areas. Something less than complete satisfaction with the list is also registered. In planning the design and scope of the study, the decision had been made to leave out professional journals. Abstracts and monthly indexes were represented but not the narrow professionally initiated journals upon which they undoubtedly do rely for many of their needs. The list of titles which they volunteered (see Appendix) reveals their awareness and use of this material, except in the case of Group B, the members of which made hardly any recommendations and rated the first questionnaire lower than Groups A or C. It may be that the absence of such material made the list seem less relevant to those who gave it a low rating. It may be that the date of publication affected the judgment of those who rated it moderately or barely relevant. But the fact that there were 142 respondent users of area titles and the fact that one-third of the respondents found the list highly relevant and one-half found it moderately so suggest that it contained a reasonable number of works pertinent to the areas whose faculty were questioned.

Question 9: Of the reference works pertaining to your area of teaching which appear in the two questionnaires, which do you use more? Ten respondents said they used Questionnaire A more, 12 checked Questionnaire B, and 2 felt that they used the two lists equally. The opinion varied with the three groups. Of the respondents in Group A, three found titles in Questionnaire A more useful; six perferred those in Questionnaire B. Of those in Group B, three found the titles in Questionnaire A more useful and four used the list in Questionnaire B more. Of those in Group C, two used List A more, two used List B, and two felt that they used the two lists equally. The respondent in Group D chose List A.

This question was included to obtain a measure, albeit subjective, of faculty use of older, standard items as opposed to current reference works. In replying to the question, the respondents' choice was not only between titles as such but between two lists, one containing all kinds of titles pertaining to the field of speech in general as well as to their area and the other containing only titles which were immediately applicable to the specialized area in which the faculty members teach. When they checked Questionnaire B they were checking concentrated, compact listing over random listing. On the other hand, when they checked Questionnaire A, they did so despite having to look through many titles in order to find those that applied to their work.

Their responses to this question were varied and interesting when correlated with their responses to the titles on the two lists. Group A, whose respondents felt by a 2-1 margin that the titles in Questionnaire B were those that they used more, actually indicated by checking titles that they used 32.32 per cent of the titles in Questionnaire A and 19.05 per cent of the titles in Questionnaire B. The respondents in Group B believed by the narrow margin of 4-3 that they used the titles in Questionnaire B more. Their answers to the titles in Questionnaire A showed 31.87 per cent of use while they used 10.09 per cent of the titles in Questionnaire B. The members of Group C indicated that they used the two lists equally with a 2-2-2 distribution of answers. The use they they actually indicated on Questionnaire A was 46.63 per cent and on Questionnaire B, 21.80 per cent. All three groups as whole units indicated heavier use of the titles in Questionnaire A. In general, individuals within the groups also used the titles of Questionnaire A more. In Group A, seven used List A more heavily, two used List B, and one used the lists equally. In Group B, all seven members used List A more heavily than that of Group B. In Group C, 6 of the members used List A more heavily than List B. It is difficult to know why, in view of the evidence, the respondents felt that they used the items of B more.

What the respondents may have been reflecting in their answers is the amount of use given the items used from both lists. Their comments relative to the question provide some of their thinking. One chose List A because more of the titles "are related specifically to children's theatre, creative dramatics, puppetry, etc." Another said that the first questionnaire "seemed to include more titles relevant to technical theatre." (That it did is questionable depending upon the nature of the parameters set for technical theater by the respondent.) A third found the choice a dilemma:

> I think I don't really know since most of "B" is new to me and I haven't really dug into them. "A" contains some new ones but lots of nice standard references.

One member in speech and hearing felt that the choice produced a "problem, though, because one [title] in B is a text I use in a grad class. As reference source or work, A." (It probably should be remarked here that it is possible for a work in the area of speech and hearing, as in other areas, to be a text as well as a reference in the same way that Gray's Anatomy has served as both text and reference source. As a point of fact, more than one editor or compiler of the texts included in Questionnaire B noted in the preface of his book this dual role of text and reference work that he hoped his book would assume.) Another respondent in this area said that he used "the ones I've check on A more. The items on B seem more pertinent to my field. I simply haven't had the need to use them." Taken together, however, what those responding have had to say about the two lists does not explain their choice of the titles in B over those in A. Here apparently the silent majority of the 18 non-commenters influenced the outcome for reasons not clear nor clearly suggested from the remarks of the six who did comment.

Summary. The respondents of this study felt preponderantly that the work of their areas required substantial support from reference materials. They indicated that they obtained reference materials from many sources outside the library. The needs of the area as well as the effects of technological advances upon the dispersal of literature dictated the kinds of extra-library sources which they used. The subjects of this study, while divided on the adequacy of extra-library sources of reference, in the majority felt that such services were not adequate. Routes to reference materials varied with the area: The faculty of the area of speech pathology and audiology found its narrow specialty addressed by a narrow band of reference works, the practitioners of general speech expressed a need for very recent information on current affairs that caused them to rely partially on outside sources, and those in the area of drama simply indicated by their checked answers without comment that they needed the reference materials available within the library. By a narrow margin the faculty said that they were well-acquainted with the current reference literature of their area, and at the same time a number of them commented upon their inability to utilize such materials as much as they would like. They found the library acquisitions list, made up and distributed by the library staff, helpful (or desirable in the event that they were not receiving it at the present time) except for two faculty members who found it unhelpful or too impractical. The strongest consensus of faculty opinion in the questionnaire was that involving their attitude on the desirability of receiving annotated lists of titles in their specific areas as they are obtained by the library. Almost unanimously, they endorsed such annotated lists and several of their comments expressed their enthusiasm. These faculty members felt that the reference librarian contributed to their work both through locating specific information for them and through informing them of the existence and the nature of new publications in their areas. Service to students and special reference service deserved only minor mention.

The sample of faculty under study believed that the first measuring instrument, Questionnaire A, was moderately to highly relevant to their areas of study. They were of divided but prevalent opinion that they used the titles occurring in Questionnaire B, that is, the current reference titles, more than those in Questionnaire A, even though the statistical evidence obtained from other parts of the study reveal that, according to the books which they checked, they do not.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of current reference books by a selected sample of university faculty in order to ascertain to what extent current reference sources appropriate to a given discipline escape attention and use by the faculty of that discipline.

The study was limited to an investigation of those reference books which might be expected to have some pertinency to the professional areas of the faculty members being studied. It did not inquire into faculty use of library services other than those closely related to reference books. Nor did it inquire into the frequency of faculty use of current reference works, or into the repeated use given any one single source. It was an inquiry into the extent to which the faculty studied knew and used the current reference literature of their field, and it sought not only data from which faculty knowledge and use of reference books might be ascertained, but also subjective faculty response from which rationales and explanations might be obtained.

Population of the Study

The population selected for the study was the faculty of the Department of Speech of Ball State University. These 26 faculty members, 19 men and 7 women, represent 3.34 per cent of the total teaching faculty of the university. They are located in one of three specific areas of teaching which, taken together, were assumed to be a reasonable representation in miniature of the kinds of academic concerns found in the university at large, for the interests of this population run the gamut from fine arts (theater), through the social sciences (general speech) to science (speech pathology and audiology). They have a well-balanced blend in years of academic training, academic rank attained, and permanent and temporary personnel. Academically and professionally, they are very active and tend to participate in a wider academic scene than this university.

Methodology

In terms of practical methodology, the study required a comparison of faculty use of older, standard reference works pertinent to their areas of teaching and of current reference sources similarly pertinent. In order that the appropriate data might be obtained, the members of this department were sent a set of two questionnaires within a period of one month.

The first questionnaire presented ten categories of the older, standard reference works by type. Distributed among the categories were 52 established reference sources in the field of speech or sources assumed to be utilized by speech. Six of the sources were general, usable by the entire department, although in varying degrees; the other 46 books were special area titles somewhat unevenly distributed among the 3 professional areas and the 10 categories of reference sources represented. All books on the list were held by the university library and shelved before January 1, 1970. The respondents were to check those titles they had used in the last five years and to volunteer others they had used in that period which did not appear on the list. From this questionnaire came the data regarding their use of older, more established reference works.

The second questionnaire was in two parts. The first part was in four forms, one for speech pathology and audiology, one for general speech, one for theater, and one for the head of the department who is a specialist in phonetics. This last form was later dropped from the study, since the individual represented an awkward class of one. Each form contained a list of current reference works held by the university library, presumably shelved after January 1, 1970, and assumed to be important to each special field of study. (Subsequently, some adjustments had to be made of titles which were extensions of other titles, or which had some earlier author, or which had been shelved too recently.) The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of acquaintanceship with the reference or para-reference titles on the list and any use of them. From this portion of this questionnaire came the data regarding the respondents' knowledge and use of current reference works pertinent to their areas. The second part of the questionnaire was a series of nine questions which inquired into the needs, habits, attitudes, and opinions of the respondents regarding current reference sources and the reactions of the respondents to the titles listed in the two questionnaires.

From the 26 faculty members in the population studied, 24 sets of questionnaires or 92.31 per cent were returned. Twenty-three sets of responses to specific reference titles were used in the study. For the second part of Questionnaire B, 24 returns were used. Data from the 23 sets of returns were used to test the hypothesis that the faculty members of a university tend not to use the current reference sources pertaining to their subject fields and held by the library as readily as they use older, better-known library reference sources, in part because they are unaware of the existence of such sources.

Summary of the Findings

A study of the data supplied in the returns of the two questionnaires revealed differences and similarities among the faculty members of the three special areas in regard to their use of the reference and para-reference sources submitted to them.

1. The three groups varied in the nature of their

use of older, standard reference sources by type of reference source consulted, by the amount of use, and by the nature of the volunteered titles.

(a) In their use of older, more established reference sources, the faculty of speech pathology and audiology used abstracts, directories, encyclopedias and dictionaries, and handbooks and manuals more heavily than the other types of reference titles submitted to them. The faculty of general speech used handbooks and manuals, bibliographies, current surveys, indexes, and collections more heavily than other types of reference titles. The faculty of theater used history and illustration, handbooks, indexes, directories and bibliographies more heavily than other types of reference works. First preferences for each tend to be supported by volunteered titles and comments made in response to Questionnaire B, Part II.

(b) In their use of older, more established reference sources, the faculty of speech pathology and audiology tended to have moderately light use of area and of general reference titles (33.33 and 31.48 per cent) and very light use (7.69 per cent) of all 52 titles in Questionnaire A. The faculty of general speech had moderately light use of area and of general reference titles (31.87 and 28.57 per cent) and used a little over one-fifth of all the titles on the list (21.15 per cent). The faculty of theater had a moderate use of the area titles (46.63 per cent) and a moderately light use of general titles (33.33 per cent); they had a slightly better use of all the titles on the list (24.73 per cent) than the other two groups. Both theater and general speech indicated good breadth of use throughout the types of reference. The faculty of theater was stronger than either of the other groups in its use of area reference sources. The faculty of general speech indicated the lowest use of area reference sources. None of the groups used a great number of sources in other areas, but the area of speech pathology and audiology seemed particularly area-bound.

(c) In response to a request to supply additional titles which they had used in the past five years but which were not on the list, the faculty of speech pathology and audiology tended to be highly repetitive in their 14 separate volunteered titles with 8 duplications. This would seem to suggest a department with close-knit interests and similar reference problems. On the other hand, the faculty of theater tended to be highly individualistic in their 28 separate volunteered titles with 1 duplication. The faculty of general speech tended to suggest types of literature and contributed only four specific titles.

2. In their use of current reference titles, the three groups maintained the rank of percentage of use they had established in response to the older titles, but all groups displayed individual group patterns of reaction to the recency of the availability of the titles and all groups dropped significantly in the extent of their use of current reference literature as compared to their use of the older

literature.

(a) The faculty of theater had the highest percentage of use of area reference titles on the list of older, standard reference works (46.43 per cent), and the group also had the highest percentage of use of current area reference titles (21.80 per cent). The faculty of speech pathology and audiology had the second highest percentage of use of the older area reference titles (33.33 per cent), and the group also had the second highest percentage of use of current area reference titles (19.05). The faculty of general speech had the lowest rank for the older reference sources (31.87 per cent) and for the newer ones as well (10.99 per cent).

(b) Individual group patterns of change in the percentages of used titles as the shelving dates became more recent were observable: The faculty of speech pathology and audiology used progressively fewer titles as shelving dates increased in recency. The faculty of general speech used more titles as the shelving dates increased in recency. The faculty of theater used very few titles shelved at the beginning of the five-year period, jumped sharply upward in the middle years, and fell most of the way to the early low in the most recent period of shelving. This is an interesting phenomenon which has no supportable explanation. Yet on the speculative level, the nature of the activities of the groups affords a tentative answer. Perhaps those respondents in speech pathology and audiology are tied to the abstracts they volunteered, periodical in nature and so outside the scope of this study. The members of general speech are likely to need the latest evidence or most current material on politics and social events. It is difficult to understand the pattern of use displayed by the faculty in theater.

No matter what the pattern of progression, the three groups were more alike than different in their use of titles from the most recent shelving period (1974) included in the study: The faculty of speech and pathology used 12.70 per cent of the titles shelved in 1974; the faculty of general speech used 17.86 per cent; and the faculty of theater used 11.43 per cent. The use by all the groups of reference sources shelved in this time period is very light.

(c) There was a significant difference between the percentages of use of standard and current reference sources for all three groups: The faculty of speech pathology and audiology used 33.33 per cent of the older standard reference sources and 19.05 per cent of the current reference sources for a difference of 14.28 percentage points. The faculty of general speech used 31.87 per cent of the older literature and 10.99 per cent of the current literature submitted to them for a difference of 20.88 percentage points. The faculty of theater used 36.87 per cent of the older reference sources and 21.80 per cent of the current reference sources submitted to them for a difference of 24.63 percentage points. This difference for each of the groups was found to be statistically significant at the critical level of .05 as measured by the "t" test. The actuality of this difference was supporting evidence for the hypothesis being tested which asserted that the faculty members of a university tend not to use the current reference sources pertaining to their subject fields and held by the library as readily as they use older better-known library reference sources, in part because they are unaware of the existence of such sources.

3. The numbers of respondents in each area of the department or the numbers of titles offered to each group did not affect percentages of use in a predictable way. The 9 members of speech pathology maintained a middle rank of use although in Questionnaire A they had 11 sources (including the general items for which they could indicate use), while the 7 members of general speech had 26 items and ranked lowest and the 7 members of theater had 16 and ranked highest. In the use of current reference sources, the respondents of speech pathology and audiology had 14 titles to which to respond and ranked second, the respondents of general speech had 13 items and ranked lowest, and the respondents of speech had 19 items and ranked highest.

4. Inferentially it is possible to project that the faculty of speech and pathology and that of theater, had they known of the books which they checked as unknown, would have been expected to use 23.30 and 26.01 of them respectively, and the faculty of general speech would have been likely to use 7.60 of those books which they checked as unknown.

The response to the nine questions in Part II of Questionnaire B yielded the following group opinions:

1. Nineteen of the 24 faculty members replying felt that the work of their specialized areas of speech requires substantial support from reference materials. Most respondents felt that they had access to reference materials from sources such as teaching areas, personal libraries, publishers, government agencies, interest groups, local libraries, dissertation copies, and interlibrary loan as well as from the central university library. Half of the respondents felt that the reference materials obtainable from these sources were adequate to their needs.

2. Twelve of the 23 who took a definite stand felt that they were not well-acquainted with the reference materials in their specific fields which have been acquired in the last five years. Slightly over half indicated that they had elected to receive notification of the new materials as they come into the library. But 23 of the 24 endorsed the idea of annotated lists of current reference materials particularly applicable to their fields.

3. Most of the faculty felt that the reference librarian's contribution to their work was two-fold: Twenty-one of them felt that it was to inform them of the existence and specific nature of new reference publications, and 19 also answered that it was to locate specific information as the need arose.

4. In response to a question which attempted to check

on the validity of one of the measuring instruments, 8 of the 24 found the titles of Questionnaire A highly relevant to their field, 12 found them moderately so, and 3 said they were barely so.

5. Nine of the group felt that they used the older reference titles in Questionnaire A more, 12 felt that they used the titles in Questionnaire B more, and 2 felt that they used the two lists equally. However, evidence from the lists of reference titles indicated that all but three of the group used the reference titles of Questionnaire A more than those of Questionnaire B.

Limitations of the Study

This study was an exploratory probe, an unsophisticatedly designed investigation into the reference habits of a specific group of faculty who were assumed to be representative of the total faculty of the university. As a study it had limitations imposed perhaps by the nature of the population, and probably by the instruments of measurement and by the concomitant factors difficult to control in a study of the knowledge and use of current reference books.

The nature of the population may have limited the study in that random sampling was not attempted in the selection of the respondents; rather, a total sample population with whatever unknown abnormalities it may have possessed was selected for the study. The number of subjects was small. The potential field of 26 became in effect 23, and that number was subdivided into faculty of special areas. A further complication of limitations imposed by the population may have been the fact that the majority of these respondents were known to the investigator. While strict objectivity was sought and the greatest possible distance was attempted during the critical portions of the study, the effect of the acquaintanceship remains an unknown factor. Perhaps the effect of this relationship might not necessarily have been deletorious to the study. The subjects permitted a great deal of probing into their academic habits. Whether their responses were altered in any way by the investigator-subject relationship is not known. The limitations, then, imposed by the population were potentially several and the outcome of the study must be considered with that in mind.

The limitations imposed upon the study by the instruments of measurement are probably several. The titles submitted in Questionnaire A were imbalanced in terms of the items in each reference category and in terms of the number offered to the faculty of each special area. For each area, the number of the titles were probably too few for conclusive results. The same difficulty of numbers of titles plagued Questionnaire B. Although the factor of numbers of titles could not be related to the percentages of use indicated by the respondents on both questionnaires, they may have had some unseen effect on that use.

A probable limitation imposed upon the findings of the study by the instruments of measurement was the unknown degree of appropriateness of the titles for the immediate work of the areas being studied. The nature of the study begged intimate knowledge of the books offered and of their relevancy to the work of the department involved. In order to minimize other factors affecting the use of current reference books, none of which for this investigation could be easily controlled, the aptness of the titles was very important. If the study is ever replicated or expanded, note should be taken of the very large amount of time required in order to select, reject, balance, and inspect each of the candidate titles in an effort to obtain those which are central rather than peripheral to the work of the subjects. In the end, the disproportionate amount of time which the selection of the titles required in this study did not seem long enough for obtaining the best possible set of instruments for measurement.

The criterion that the reference source had to be library-held may have been a further limitation provided by the instruments of measurement. In measuring what use the respondents made of current literature, they should possibly have been submitted a list of the current pertinent and central reference sources which were in existence rather than those which were available from the central library source. Comments which the respondents made in Part II of Questionnaire B indicated that not all their reference work is done in the central library and, to the extent that that is so, the results of this distort their actual use of current reference.

Finally, there are limitations imposed by concomitant factors which may have affected use of reference sources older or current. The hypothesis of this study asserted a relationship between knowledge of a book and its use that did not rule out other factors. The study measured but did not account for faculty failure to use well-known current sources. It did not control such factors as respondents' preference for certain reference sources or formats (although the number of responses in any given group acted as a partial control of this factor) and the influence of fellow faculty reports of the usefulness of given sources upon a faculty member's use of that source.

In brief, through population, instrument, and the existence of concomitant factors, the study has many sources of possible error.

Conclusions

In view of the number of limitations suggested above, the results of the quantitative portion of this study cannot be considered conclusive. Yet the findings seem to support three tentative judgments:

1. From the evidence obtained from this study, it appears that a considerable portion of reference literature pertinent to a given discipline escapes the attention and use of faculty members of that discipline.

2. The evidence further suggests that the faculty of a university, insofar as they are not unlike those in the sample population, tend to use the older, better-known reference and para-reference sources pertinent to their special area of academic concern more readily than they use those originating in the last five years.

3. The evidence also suggests that one of the factors in the failure of the faculty to use at least a portion of current reference sources is the fact that they do not know that it exists. The opinions and comments of a number of the respondents tend to support this suggestion.

Implications of the Study

The various patterns of faculty use of the types of reference sources and their use of the current reference sources as they were distributed in time bands of recency in the study speak to the possibilities to be found in library initiative and response. If it is possible to predict faculty reference direction and reference behavior in terms of recency of sources, it may be possible to tailor reference service to such expressed needs. Such a demand-supply situation suggests need of subject-specialist librarians who understand the work of each area in a way the generalist cannot, but more importantly, it suggests the need of a constant faculty-librarian dialogue.

The response of the faculty of this study to the possibility of annotated acquisition lists of current reference tools in their field would suggest both need and eagerness to be apprised of new reference tools in a meaningful way. Such a faculty posture would seem to provide librarians with an ideal opportunity to strengthen professional relationships with faculty members. If the attitudes of this faculty are typical, those relationships are not inimical.

If it is true that faculty would be likely to increase their use of reference sources pertinent to their work if they knew that they existed, it would seem that, on behalf of the total educational adventure, librarians should assume the task of "marketing" special area reference resources. Ease and the "torpidity" mentioned by one of the respondents are such powerful forces that it may be to the advantage of librarians to become traveling salesmen. If through publishers, commercial tape offerings, and other extra-library sources the faculty are turning to materials brought to them, it would seem worthwhile to meet the challenge.

Suggestions for Further Study

This study of current reference knowledge and use was modest, exploratory, and by its nature not strongly conclusive. It would be profitable to repeat it with a greater number of titles, a larger population, and a tighter design. The design should be improved to record faculty use of current reference materials before and after they had received specific information about current reference titles whose pertinency to their special area of work had been carefully annotated. Such a study would carry the suggestions of this one into the realm of more certain measurability.

Any study which is likely to disclose concealed faculty needs for reference or to describe faculty reference habits or reference methodology would be a useful study, and would refine the nature and extent of the library service which librarians and their staff can devise and provide for their faculty colleagues.

NOTES

[1] Louis Shores, *Basic Reference Books* (2nd ed.; Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1937), p. 6.

[2] American Library Association, *A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms with a Selection of Terms in Related Fields* (Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1943), p. 112.

[3] R. N. Logsdon, "Librarian and the Scholar: Eternal Enemies," *Library Journal*, XCV (September 15, 1970), 2874.

[4] *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information* (New York: R. R. Bowker Co.). Several editions were consulted: 13th ed., 1963, p. 61; 15th ed., 1970, p. 24; 17th ed., 1972, p. 176; 19th ed., 1974, pp. 183-184.

[5] Bohdan S. Wyner, "Preface," *Index to American Reference Books Annual, 1970-1974: A Cumulative Index to Subjects, Authors and Titles* (Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1974), pp. vii-viii.

[6] David H. Eyman, comp. *Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science: Titles Accepted by Accredited Library Schools, 1930-1972* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University Microfilms, 1973), passim.

[7] Maurice F. Tauber, C. Donald Cook, and Richard Logsdon. *The Columbia University Libraries* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), Appendix IV, pp. 280-287.

[8] Norman E. Tanis, *Library Services for Kansas State College: Planning for the Next Decade by Means of a College-Wide Series of Questionnaires* (A four-part survey of the users of Kansas State College, Pittsburgh, Kansas: Kansas State College, 1968; reproduced by ERIC/CLIS, Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1969), pp. 28-58.

[9] Joseph Nathaniel Whitten. *Relation of College Instruction to Libraries in 72 Liberal Arts Colleges* (Doctoral dissertation; New York University, 1958; reproduced by microfilm-zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969), pp. 262-266.

[10] Logsdon, "Librarian and the Scholar," p. 2871.

[11] Patricia B. Knapp, *The Monteith College Library Experiment* (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1966), pp. 41-42.

[12] Anne W. Schumacher. *A Small College Information System: An Analysis and Recommendations* (St. Paul, Minnesota: Hamline University, 1968), ch. III, pp. 11-12.

[13] J(erold) A. Nelson, "Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Toward Academic Library Reference Services: A Measure of Communication," *College & Research Libraries*, XXXIV (September, 1973), 218-269.

[14] Florence DeHart, *The Application of Special Library Services and Techniques to the College Library* (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1964; reproduced by microfilm zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilm, 1969), p. 131.

[15] James O. Lehman, "Library Faculty Liason in the Small College," *Southeastern Librarian*, XX (Summer, 1970), 103.

[16] J. Hall, "Information Services in University Libraries," *ASLIB Proceedings*, XXIV (May, 1972), 299.

[17] Virginia B. Harris, "Hands Across the Disciplines," *Learning Today*, V (Fall, 1972), 17-18.

[18] Herbert F. Johnson, Jack B. King, and Ann S. Mavor, *A Feasibility Study for Establishing An Information Switching Center at Hamline University* (St. Paul, Minnesota: Hamline University, 1970; reproduced Bethesda, Maryland: Eric Document Reproduction Service, 1970), ch. V, pp. 1-5.

[19] Richard M. Dougherty, "Evaluation of Campus Library Document Delivery Service," *College & Research Libraries*, XXXIV (January, 1973), 29-39.

[20] Susan M. Evans and Maurice B. Line, "A Personalized Service to Academic Researchers: The Experimental Information Service in the Social Sciences at the University of Bath," *Journal of Librarianship*, V (July, 1973), 214-232.

[21] Abram Venable Lawson, *Reference Service in University Libraries; Two Case Studies* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1969; reproduced by microfilm zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1972), p. 210.

[22] Samuel Rothstein, *The Development of Reference Services in American Research Libraries* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1954; reproduced by microfilm zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1973), pp. 236-237.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. Editorial Committee. Subcommittee on Library Terminology. *A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms with a Selection of Terms in Related Fields*. Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1943.

Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 8th, 10th, 12th, and 14th ed. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1968, 1970, 1972, and 1974 respectively.

DeHart, Florence Elizabeth. *The Application of Special Library Services and Techniques to the College Library*. Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers--The State University, 1964; reproduced by microfilm-zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969.

Dougherty, R. M. "Evaluation of Campus Library Document Delivery Service." *College & Research Libraries*, XXXIV (January, 1973), 29-39.

Evans, Susan M., and Line, Maurice B. "A Personalized Service to Academic Researchers: The Experimental Information Service in the Social Sciences at the University of Bath." *Journal of Librarianship*, V (July, 1973), 214-232.

Eyman, David H., comp. *Doctoral Dissertations in Library Science: Titles Accepted by Accredited Library Schools, 1920-1972*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University Microfilms, 1973.

Hall, J. "Information Services in University Libraries." *ASLIB Proceedings*, XXIV (May, 1972), 293-302.

Harris, Virginia B. "Hands Across the Disciplines." *Learning Today*, V (Fall, 1972), 17-18.

Johnson, Hubert F.; King, Jack B.; and Mavor, Anne S. *A Feasibility Study for Establishing An Information Switching Center at Hamline University*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Hamline University, 1968; reproduced at Bethesda, Maryland: Eric Document Reproduction Service, 1970.

Josey, E. J. "Enhancing and Strengthening Library Relationships." Journal of Negro Education, XXXIII (September, 1964), 191-96.

King, J. B., and others. "What Future, Reference Librarian?" RQ, X (Spring, 1971), 243-247.

Knapp, Patricia B. College Teaching and the College Library. ACRL Monograph No. 23. Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1959.

__________. The Monteith College Library Experiment. New York: Scarecrow Press, 1966.

Lawson, Abram Venable. Reference Service in University Libraries: Two Case Studies. Doctoral dissertation Columbia University, 1969; reproduced by microfilm-zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1972.

Lehman, James O. "Library Faculty Liason in the Small College." Southeastern Librarian, XX (Summer, 1970), 100-105.

Line, Maurice B. Review of The Making of a Library: The Academic Librarian in Transition, by Robert S. Taylor. Library Quarterly, XLIII (July, 1973), 249-50.

Logsdon, Richard. "The Library and the Scholar: Eternal Enemies." Library Journal, XCV (September 15, 1970), 2871-2874.

Maizell, Robert E. "Information Gathering Patterns and Creativity." American Documentation, XI (January, 1960), 9-17.

Nelson, Jerold A. "Faculty Awareness and Attitudes toward Academic Library Reference Services: A Measure of Communication." College & Research Libraries, XXXIV (September, 1973), 268-75.

__________. "Suavity and Sacrifice." California Librarian, XXXIV (April, 1973), 34-44.

Redmond, Donald A.; Sinclair, Michael P.; and Brown, Elinore. "University Libraries and University Research." College & Research Libraries, XXXIII (November, 1972), 447-453.

Rosenberg, Victor. "Factors Affecting the Preferences of Industrial Personnel for Information Gathering Methods." Information Storage Retrieval, III (July, 1967), 119-127.

Schumacher, Anne W. *A Small College Information System: An Analysis and Recommendations*. St. Paul: Hamline University, 1968.

Shores, Louis. *Basic Reference Books*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Illinois: American Library Association, 1939.

Stern, Louis W. "Promotion of Information Services: An Evaluation of Alternative Approaches." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, XXIV (May-June, 1973), 171-79.

Stiffler, Stuart A. "A Book Is A Book Is A Reference Book." *RQ*, XI (Summer, 1972), 341-343.

Tanis, Norman E. *Library Services for Kansas State College: Planning for the Next Decade by Means of a College-Wide Series of Questionnaires*. Unpublished survey of Kansas State College at Pittsburgh, Kansas, 1968; reproduced by microfilm-zerography, Minneapolis, Minnesota: ERIC/CLIS, 1969.

Taylor, Robert S. "Question Negotiation and Information Seeking." *College & Research Libraries*, XXIX (May, 1968), 178-194.

Tauber, Maurice F.; Cook, C. Donald; and Logsdon, Richard H. *The Columbia University Libraries*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Whitten, Joseph Nathaniel. *Relationship of College Instruction to Libraries in 72 Liberal Arts Colleges*. Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958; reproduced by microfilm-zerography, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969.

Wyner, Bohdan S. "Preface." *Index to American Reference Books Annual, 1970-1974: A Cumulative Index to Subjects, Authors and Titles*. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1974.

APPENDIX

COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE A

April 3, 1975

I am writing to you to ask for your help in supplying some information much needed in a study of reference works in which I am currently involved. I am directing my request to members of the speech faculty because the work of your department is sufficiently diverse to make it a near-microcosm of the all-school faculty.

This study is directed toward determining whether or not there is a need for libraries to alter their informational programs. It is not directed toward making inquiry into whether or not members of the speech faculty have a mastery of the literature of the field. Only those works considered reference works are being studied.

The definition of reference work can be stated in several ways: According to the American Library Association it is "a book designed by its arrangement and treatment to be consulted for definite items of information rather than to be read consecutively." It may also be considered to be a miscellany arranged in some consistent fashion and concentrating on facts or materials separate in origin but drawn together in collection by virtue of form, genre, nationality, etc. Reference works fall into the following standard categories: abstracts, almanacs, annuals, atlases, bibliographies, calendars, catalogs, checklists, collections, compendiums, concordances, dictionaries, digests, directories, encyclopedias, finding lists, gazetteers, guidebooks, guides to literature, handbooks, indexes, inventories, loose-leaf services, manuals, red books, registers, source books, surveys, tables, union lists, yearbooks, or any reasonable variation of any of these.

The design of my study requires that information be obtained from two questionnaires distributed about one week or so apart. Both require little time to complete. Enclosed with this letter is the first of the two-- hopefully designed to elicit the maximum response with the minimum of effort on your part. It would be most helpful if you would return the completed form to the location appearing on the third page of the form no later than April 10.

It is my hope that we both might profit from your participation in the study. At its completion I should like to send you a sample of the kind of envisioned service which prompted this project.

Yours truly,

Jeanne D. Strother

QUESTIONNAIRE A

Below are a number of types of materials for which, as a faculty member, you possibly have a need. Would you please indicate which of the sources listed in each category you have used or have recommended for students' use within the last five years? Following each list, space has been provided for other sources of the some type which you may have consulted or may have recommended.

1. *Abstracts*

___ *Child Development Abstracts and Bibliography*.
___ *DSH Abstracts (American Speech and Hearing Association)*.
___ *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
___ *Psychological Abstracts*.
___ *Resources in Education* (formerly Research in Education).
___ Other abstracts I have used:

2. *Bibliographies*

___ Baker, Blanch M. *Theatre and Allied Arts: A Guide...*
___ Cleary, J.W. *Rhetoric and Public Address: A Bibliography*.
___ Goldberg, I.I. *Selected Bibliography of Special Education*.
___ Kruger, Arthur N. *A Classified Bibliography of Argumentation and Debate*.
___ Lerman, Alan *Vocational Adjustment and the Deaf: A Guide and Annotated Bibliography*.
___ Roach, Helen P. *Spoken Records*.
___ Other bibliographies I have used:

3. *Collections*

___ Baird, A.C. *Representative American Speeches*.
___ Commager, H.S. *Documents of American History*
___ *Documents on American Foreign Relations*.
___ *U.S. Federal Register*.
___ *Vital Speeches of the Day*.
___ ISCPET Oral Interpretation Curriculum Study Conference, Monmouth College, 1968. *Oral Interpretation and the Teaching of English; a Collection of Readings*.
Other collections I have used:

4. Current Surveys

__ *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report.*
__ *Facts on File: A Weekly World News Digest with Cumulative Index.*
__ *Keesing's Contemporary Archives: Weekly Diary of World Events...*
__ Other current surveys I have used:

5. Directories

__ Anderson, Robert M., and J.W. Anderson. *Instructional Resources for Teachers of the Culturally Disadvantaged and Exceptional.*
__ *Simon's Directory of Theatrical Materials, Services, and Information.*
__ U.S. Office of Education. *Education Directory.*
__ Other directories I have used:

6. Encyclopedias and Dictionaries

__ Adams, James Truslow. *Dictionary of American History.*
__ Bowman, W.P., and R.H. Ball. *Theatre Language: A Dictionary of Terms.*
__ Chujoy, Anatole, and P.W. Manchester. *The Dance Encyclopedia.*
__ Kenyon, John Samuel, and T.A. Knott. *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English.*
__ Plano, Jack C., and Milton Greenberg. *The American Political Dictionary.*
__ Sharp, Harold S., and Marjorie Z. Sharp. *Index to Characters in the Performing Arts.*
__ Wilcox, Ruth Turner. *The Dictionary of Costume.*
__ Other encyclopedias and dictionaries I have used:

7. Handbooks and Manuals

__ *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.*
__ Lounsbury, Warren C. *Theater Backstage From A to Z.*
__ Sobel, Bernard. *The New Theatre Handbook.*
__ Sturgis, Alice F. *Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.*
Other handbooks or manuals I have used:

8. History and Illustration

__ Cambridge Modern History.
__ Davenport, Millia. The Book of Costume. 2 v.
__ Nicoll, Allardyce. The Development of the Theatre: A Study of Theatrical Art from the Beginnings to the Present Day.
__ Odell, George Clinton Densmore. Annals of the New York Stage. 15 v.
Other sources of history or illustration I have used:

9. Indexes

__ Debate Index.
__ Guide to the Performing Arts.
__ Play Index.
__ Salem, James M. A Guide to Critical Reviews, 1920-1965.
__ Sutton, Roberta Briggs. Speech Index.
__ U.S. Supt. of Documents. Document Catalog.
__ U.S. Supt. of Documents. Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications.
Other indexes I have used:

10. Statistics

__ Statesman's Yearbook; Statistical and Historical Annual of the States of the World.
__ United Nations. Statistical Office. Statistical Yearbook...
__ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States.
__ U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States.
__ U.S. National Vital Statistics Division. Vital Statistics of the United States.
__ Wassermann, Paul, et al. Statistical Sources: A Subject Guide to Data...
__ World Almanac and Book of Facts.
Other sources of statistics I have used:

Questionnaires may be returned in their mailers to the Main Speech Office where they will be picked up no later than 4:30 p.m. April 10.

TITLES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS AS SOME THEY HAD USED WHICH WERE NOT ON THE LIST

Abstracts

Group A:

Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations in the Field of Speech Communication
Rehabilitation Literature (monthly abstracting tool)

Bibliographies and Catalogs

Group A:

Current Citations

Group B:

Quarterly Journal of Speech Speech Monographs	Noted using selected bibliographies relating to various debate topics and their compilation of the same. Indexes, statistical sources, surveys, directories. Specific sources unnamed here.

Group C:

Bibliographic Annual in Speech Communication
Catalogs:
  Baker Plays
  Dramatic Play Service
  French, Samuel
  Tams-Witmark
N.C.T.E. Committee on Play List. Guide to Play Selection. 2nd ed.
Shearer, Ned A. Bibliographic Annual in Speech.

Indexes

Group A:

Acta Otolaryngologica
Education Index
Index Medicus (2)

Group B:

Group C:

Index to Journals in Speech Communication
Ottemiller, J. H. Index to Plays in Collections

Collections

Group A:

Wrage, E. J., and Baskerville, B. American Forum: Speeches on Historic Issues

Group B:

Group C:

Mantle, Burns, et al. Best Plays of ________.

Current Surveys

No titles offered.

Directories

Group A:

American Speech and Hearing Association Directory (ASHA Directory) 5x
Indiana Hearing Aid Specialists Association Directory (Pamphlet) 2x

Group B:

Group C:

Directory of the American Educational Theatre Association
Directory of the Indiana Speech Association
Directory of the Speech Communication Association
Directory of Stage Directors and Choreographers
Who's Who in America
Who's Who in Midwest

Encyclopedias and Dictionaries

Group A:

Delk Dictionary of Audiology   Unnamed medical dictionary

Group B:

Encyclopaedia Britannica

Group C:

Americana
Britannica
World Book Encyclopedia
Reader's Encyclopedia of World Drama

Handbooks

Group A:

Katz, Jack. Handbook of Audiology.
Robert's Rules of Order
Travis. Handbook of Speech Pathology. 4x

Group B:

Coger, Leslie, and White, Melvin. Reader's Theatre Handbook.

Group C:

Robert's Rules of Order

History and Illustration

Group A:

Group B:

Group C:

Avery, Scoutin, et al. The London Stage, 1660-1800. 11 vols.
Bentley, Gerald. Jacobean and Carolinean Stage.
Brockett, Oscar. The Theatre: An Introduction. 3rd ed.
Nagler, A. M. Sourcebook in Theatrical History.
Selzer, Daniel. The Modern Theatre; Readings and Documents.
Simonson, Lee. The Art of Design.

COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE B

April 20, 1975

Thank you very much for your generous cooperation in filling out the questionnaire I recently sent you. You may have considered it a curious list of the reference tools in the field of speech--somewhat dated and incomplete at that. The returns, however, were almost total, and no one sent back any wrong or disgracing answers!

Enclosed with this note is the second and final questionnaire. You will find, I think, that it concentrates more narrowly upon your area of teaching than did the first. I would appreciate your being as expansive and creative with it as your time will allow. Although I sorely need to know if and how well you know each of the titles in Part I, I especially hope that in Part II you let all your feelings about your relationship with the library spill out upon the page!

Appreciatively,

Could you return the form to
the Main Speech Office by
April 28?

QUESTIONNAIRE B

I. By inserting a checkmark in the first or second column or a short answer in the third, please indicate in the spaces to the right of each reference title how well you know that publication.

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
Black, Martha E. School Speech Therapy; A Source Book.			
Byrd, Oliver E., and Thomas R. Byrd. Medical Readings on Vision, Speech, and Hearing.			
Carterette, Edward C., and Morton P. Freedman. Biology of Perceptual Systems. (Handbook of Perception, Vol. III)			
Council on Education of the Deaf. Standards for the Certification of Teachers of the Hearing Impaired.			
Dickson, David Ross, and Wilma M. Maue. Human Vocal Anatomy.			
Duker, Sam. Time-Compressed Speech: An Anthology and Bibliography in Three Volumes.			
Emerick, Lon L. and C. E. Hamre, comp. An Analysis of Stuttering; Selected Readings.			
Fellendorf, George W. Bibliography on Deafness, Supplement. (Alexander Graham Bell Assoc. for the Deaf)			

Form A

Questionnaire B Cont'd

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
Goodglass, Harold, and Sheila Blumstein. Psycholinguistics and Aphasia.			
Indiana. Commission for the Handicapped. Directory of Services for the Handicapped in Indiana.			
International Directory: Schools and Organizations for the Deaf.			
Katz, Jack, ed. Handbook of Clinical Audiology.			
Moses, Gerald R., comp. and ed. Readings in Speech Disfluency.			
Palmer, John Milton. Anatomy for Speech and Hearing.			
Reagan, Cora Lee. Handbook of Auditory Perceptual Training.			
Sarno, Martha Taylor, comp. Aphasia: Selected Readings.			
Sheehan, Joseph Green, and others. Stuttering: Research and Therapy.			
Wolfe, Wallace Dean, and Daniel J. Goulding. Articulation and Learning; New Dimensions in Research, Diagnostics and Therapy.			

Form A

QUESTIONNAIRE B

I. By inserting a checkmark in the first or second column or a short answer in the third, please indicate in the spaces to the right of each reference title how well you know that publication.

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
Adams, A. John, and Joan Martin Burke. *Civil Rights: A Current Guide to the People, Organizations, and Events.*			
American Statistics Index.			
Bahn, Eugene, and Margaret Bahn. *A History of Oral Interpretation.*			
Barrett, Harold, ed. *Rhetoric of the People. Is There Any Better or Equal Hope in the World?*			
Brandes, Paul Dickerson. *The Rhetoric of Revolt.*			
Chicorel, Marietta, ed. *Chicorel Index to Poetry in Anthologies and Collections in Print.* *Chicorel Index to Poetry in Collections in Print, on Discs and Tapes; Poetry on Discs, Tapes, and Cassettes.*			
Coger, Leslie Irene, and Melvin R. White. *Reader's Theatre Handbook: A Dramatic Approach to Literature.*			
Congressional Information Service. *CIS Annual.*			

Form 3

Questionnaire B Cont'd

2

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For the Following Purpose(s)
Countries of the World. (Based on background information from U.S. State Dept.)			
Deadline Data on World Affairs. (A file service by DMS, Inc.)			✓
Dictionary of World History.			
Ehninger, Douglas, comp. Contemporary Rhetoric; A Reader's Coursebook.			
Laqueur, Walter Z., ed. A Dictionary of Politics.			
McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Biography; An International Reference Work. 12 v.			
Nelson, Alice Ruth (Moore) Dunbar. Masterpieces of Negro Eloquence; . . . (The Basic Afro-American Reprint Library)			
O'Neill, Daniel Joseph, ed. Speeches by Black Americans.			
The Prospect of Rhetoric: Report of the National Developmental Project. Natl. Conf. on Rhetoric, St. Charles, Ill.			
Ralph Nader Congress Project. Citizens' Look at Congress. Statistical Supplement to Congressional Profiles.			
Stewart, Charles J., comp. On Speech Communications: An Anthology of Contemporary Writings and Messages.			

Form B

QUESTIONNAIRE B

I. By inserting a checkmark in the first or second column or a short answer in the third, please indicate in the spaces to the right of each reference title how well you know that publication.

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
American Film Institute. The American Film Institute Catalog of Motion Pictures Produced in the United States.			
Arnold, Janet. Patterns of Fashion: Englishwomen's Dresses and Their Construction. 2 v.			
Brockett, O., and R. Findley. Century of Innovation: A History of European and American Theatre and Drama Since 1870.			
Bryson, Nicholas L. Thermoplastic Scenery for Theatre.			
Burris-Meyer, Harold, and Edward C. Cole. Scenery for the Theatre: The Organization, Processes, Materials, & Techniques . . .			
Chicorel, Marietta. Chicorel Theater Index to Plays for Young People in Periodicals, Anthologies, . . . Chicorel Theater Index to Plays in Anthologies. . . . Chicorel Bibliography to the Performing Arts.			
Clurman, Harold. The Divine Pastime: Theatre Essays.			

Form C

Questionnaire B Cont'd

2

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
Contemporary Literary Criticism.			
Crowell's Handbook of Contemporary Drama.			
Hatch, James Vernon. Black Image on the American Stage: A Bibliography of Plays and Musicals.			
Highfill, Phillip H., Jr., and others. A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800. In progress.			
Kirby, E. T. Total Theatre; A Critical Anthology.			
Lowe, Claudia Jean. A Guide to Reference and Bibliography for Theatre Research.			
McCarty, Clifford. Published Screenplays: A Checklist.			
McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of World Drama; An International Reference Work in Four Volumes.			
Matlaw, Myron. Modern World Drama: An Encyclopaedia.			
The National Directory for the Performing Arts and Civic Centers.			

Form C

Questionnaire B Cont'd

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For Following Purpose(s)
The New York Times Theater Reviews, 1920-1970.			
Palmer, Helen H., and Jane Ann Dyson. *American Drama Criticism; Interpretations 1890-1965. . .*			
Pride, Leo B., ed. *International Theatre Directory: A World Directory of the Theatre and Performing Arts.*			
Salem, James M. *A Guide to Critical Reviews.*			
Smith, C. Ray, comp. *The Theatre Crafts Book of Costume.*			
Who's Who in Show Business: The International Directory of the Entertainment World.			

Form C

QUESTIONNAIRE B

I. By inserting a checkmark in the first or second column or a short answer in the third, please indicate in the spaces to the right of each reference title how well you know that publication.

Title	Do Not Know	Know But Have Not Used	Have Used For the Following Purpose(s)
Cartier, Francis A., and Martin T. Todaro. The Phonetic Alphabet.			
Copperud, Roy H. American Usage: The Consensus.			
Form and Substance. Phonetic and Linguistic Papers Presented to Eli Fischer-Jørgensen.			
Haas, William. Phono-Graphic Translation.			
Hartmann, R. R. K., and F. C. Stork. Dictionary of Language and Linguistics.			
International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 7th, Montreal, 1971. Proceedings.			
Zwirner, Eberhard, and Kurt Zwirner. Principles of Phonometrics. Tr. by H. Blume. (Containing a seventy-five page history of phonetics.)			

Form D

Questionnaire B Cont'd

II. Check the appropriate blank and wherever possible please supply explanation or comment freely.

1. Do you feel that the work of your field requires substantial support from reference materials?
   Yes____ No____ Explanation:

2. Do you have access to recent reference materials relevant to your work through some other source than the library?
   Departmental library____ Teaching area collection____ Personal library____
   Some other source ____ No other source ____

3. Are such reference materials as are obtained from these extra-library sources adequate for your needs?
   Yes____ No____

4. Do you feel well-acquainted with the reference materials in your specific field which the library has acquired within the last five years?
   Yes____ No____ Probable reason:

5. Did you elect to receive the list of recent additions of books catalogued which is periodically prepared and sent to interested faculty by this university library?
   Yes____ No____ Reason for choice:

Questionnaire B Cont'd

6. Would an annotated list of recently acquired reference titles specifically directed to your area of scholarship be of value to you in preparing bibliographies, etc.?
Yes____ No____ Comment:

7. What do you perceive the reference librarian's contribution to your work to be?
____ Locating specific information as the need arises for you
____ Informing you of the existence and specific nature of new reference publications which apply to your field
____ Other contributions Specify: ____________________

8. Ignoring the books included in the first questionnaire which lie outside your area of teaching, how would you rate the relevance of those on that list which do apply to your field?
____ Highly relevant ____ Barely relevant ____ Moderately so

9. Of the reference works pertaining to your area of teaching which appear in the two questionnaires, which do you use more?
____ Those appearing in Questionnaire A
____ Those appearing in Questionnaire B